The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 1924 NUMBER 502

Contents

The Week 193

Editorials

The Meaning of the La Follette Candidacy 196
The Approaching Conflict 198
Taxes and Large Incomes 199

General Articles

"La Follette for President!" ..... Robert Littell 201
Is It War or Peace in Europe? . Sisley Huddleston 203
Sublimation ..... Clara Savage Littledale 205
The Myth of the Death Ray .....
..... E. E. Fournier D'Albe 207
An American Plan to Outlaw War 208
Vista ..... Stark Young 212

Correspondence 213

Reviews of Books

Creative Experience ..... H. A. Overstreet 214
George III and Pitt ..... David S. Muzzey 215
Alliances for the Mind ..... Henry B. Fuller 216
The New Romance ..... A. Donald Douglas 217
Sunrise Trumpets ..... Glenn Hughes 218

The Week

POLITICAL quarrels are laid aside as the whole nation extends heartfelt sympathy to Mr. and Mrs. Coolidge on the untimely death of their sixteen-year-old son, Calvin, Junior. No loss is more tragic than that which occurs on the threshold of young manhood, and without the adjustment which is possible for the parents when death is preceded by an extended period of illness. A personal bereavement of this sort makes the pomp and circumstance of office seem temporarily very unimportant things to the whole nation as undoubtedly to the President and his wife.

AS these words are written the National Convention of the Democratic party after balloting furiously for eight or nine days is still unable to reach any decision as to its candidate for President. By the time the words are published the delegates may have become sufficiently concerned for the welfare of the Democratic party to break the deadlock, but if and when they do abandon the contest and its associated war psychology they will have seriously injured the moral unity of the party and its future ability to elect its nominee. It will have injured the Democratic moral unity and its fighting ability, not merely because it yielded to such a prolonged and bitter conflict, but because there was a manifest discrepancy between the fierceness of the quarrel and the importance of the issue. If the Democratic party had enjoyed good moral health, its members could scarcely have permitted themselves to wax so irascible and obstinate in their support of or opposition to the rival claims of Messrs. McAdoo and Smith. There were plausible and sound reasons for both promoting and preventing the nomination of these two gentlemen, but they did not justify the two factions either in insisting or protesting as irreconcilably and as tenaciously as they have.

IS there any sufficient rational explanation of the fierceness and duration of this dispute? If there is, it certainly does not lie near the surface. The quarrel seems to have been provoked by the tactics which the supporters of Governor Smith employed in order to defeat McAdoo. Mr. McAdoo has for some years aggressively campaigned for the nomination. His services to his party and the advantages of his candidacy were very great. If he had been more scrupulous as a lawyer in selecting his clients, nothing could have prevented his success. But Mr. Doheny's exposure of his business relationship with Mr. McAdoo encouraged the latter's opponents and discouraged his friends. Many of his prominent supporters were ready to quit. The candidate himself, however, decided to go ahead, and as soon as the delegates began to be elected he developed in spite of his handicap remarkable strength. On the other hand the opposition to him focussed on Governor Smith, and it too was very successful in electing delegates. The trouble began when the friends of Governor Smith decided to promote his election by declaring an irreconcilable warfare on Mr. McAdoo, and by raising to that end the issue of the Klan. Their attitude stiffened the back of the McAdoo supporters. They felt that Mr. McAdoo's disqualifications were unfairly exaggerated for the benefit of a candidate whose nomination would have defied one of the strongest prejudices of a large fraction of the party. They were willing, consequently, to support Mr. McAdoo in a reckless attempt to besiege his opponents into yielding.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SUCH is a rough but substantially true account of how the deadlock occurred. But while it may indicate the way in which the quarrel originated, it does not sufficiently account for its duration and implacability. The Democratic party would have suffered less from the nomination of either McAdoo or Smith than it has from the prolonged and bitter contest between their rival claims. If the party had known its own mind and had been prepared to take advantage of its opportunities, it would not have allowed itself to become so deeply involved in a factious quarrel. That it should have succumbed to so much irascibility and dissension is almost certainly traceable to the existence within the party of latent sources of maladjustment and irritation analogous to those which were present undeniably but in different forms at the Cleveland conventions of both the Republicans and the progressives.

MR. McADOO in his public statements has attributed the strenuous opposition to his candidacy and consequently his defeat to the machinations of big business. The explanation is too simple. There is no sufficient evidence that Mr. McAdoo was defeated by the opposition which his comparative radicalism aroused. What probably did defeat him was the impotence of his radicalism to secure the support of a majority of the Democratic party. The Democrats are only very hesitatingly and mildly progressive in their attitude towards economic questions. McAdoo was too positive, too strenuous and too emphatic in his economic program for the southern and eastern members of the party, and he was also too masterful a man, too willing to assume leadership and too capable in exercising it. The Democratic Congressmen and Senators are as indisposed as are the Republican to allow a really strong leader like Roosevelt or Wilson again to obtain the office of President. They prefer a negative candidate and the majority of the party prefers a negative, middling program. A comparatively negative nominee as well as platform is what they will undoubtedly get. The Democrats are not at present spiritually prepared for adventures. Both McAdoo and Smith represented something too positive to satisfy the Democratic party as a whole. Its national convention of 1924 indulged in brave and bitter contests only to reach tame and inoffensive conclusions. By its behavior it has thrown away its chance of capturing any large portion of the disgruntled voters who are asking the two parties for some sufficient reason to have faith in them and in what politics can do for national betterment.

ONE could argue plausibly that the United States today possesses six important political groups, corresponding roughly to those in the chief European countries. These are: (1) Conservative, (2) Fascist, (3) Catholic, (4) Liberal, (5) Socialist, (6) Communist. Of these, (1) is represented by the Coolidge end of the Republican party, (2) by the dry Protestant group among the Democrats, (3) by the wet supporters of Al Smith, (4) by the forces which last week at Cleveland aligned themselves behind Senator La Follette. The fifth and sixth groups, at present the least important in the series, are represented by the parties bearing their respective names, one of them, the Communist, being virtually underground. The electorate, of course, will not be offered these six choices on the ballot next November. The Communists will not appear at all, the Socialist vote will be diverted to La Follette and the two groups within the Democratic party will probably (and perhaps before these lines appear in print) have patched up a truce with a compromise candidate who is neither warmly liked nor cordially hated by either faction. Yet the line of cleavage is unmistakable and important.

OF the second Cleveland convention of 1924, reported in detail elsewhere in this issue, it is sufficient to say that it contained no surprises. Senator La Follette did not wait for the Democratic convention to choose its candidate before deciding whether or not to throw his hat into the ring; and there was no reason why he should do so. The platform adopted by the Democrats was sufficient evidence of their timid and compromising mood on the outstanding issues which the progressives regard as vital in the forthcoming campaign. Compared to the New York platform, that adopted by the La Follette group, while itself obviously a political document written for political purposes, is a miracle of courage and common sense. It is substantially the former platform of the Wisconsin state convention, except that it proposes a partial remedy for unemployment and a state-aided machinery for marketing farm products.

POLITICAL intelligence was shown by the convention in sticking to Senator La Follette's plan and refusing to put a complete third party ticket in the field at this time. Progressivism is not at present a political label. It is much more a thing of the spirit, which may be possessed by men calling themselves Republicans in some instances, Democrats in others. The Progressives in the House and Senate who banded together to do effective work in the last session wore the labels of three parties. Some of these men are up for reëlection this year; and would in all probability lose if they attempted to break their old party affiliations. Under the La Follette plan there is no need for them to do so. The Senator from Wisconsin will run as an independent. In any locality any other good man may be endorsed on the Republican, Democratic or Farmer-Labor ticket, the one candidacy interfering in no wise with the other. After the election will be time enough to talk about a new party—a new party looking toward 1928.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE decision of the Socialist party by an overwhelming majority to endorse Senator La Follette as the progressive candidate for President is another extraordinary illustration of the passing of the old party loyalties and alignments. La Follette is not a Socialist and his platform is an utterly defective application and re-statement of traditional Socialist doctrine. The Socialists could not have endorsed him, had not their own struggle with the Communists forced them to abandon the Marxian dogmas and move towards an opportunist progressivism. They ought to bring a substantial increase of strength to La Follette. They have polled during the last three campaigns somewhere between 650,000 and 900,000 votes. Probably a quarter of this total may prefer the Communist candidate but if the remainder support La Follette it will enable him to make a much better showing than he otherwise would in the large cities.

MR. McADOO'S friends have protested with vehemence that it has not been genuine Democrats who have fought so long and bitterly to prevent his nomination. The action, it is explained, was the work of wicked Republicans. Fearful of Mr. McAdoo's liberalism, and of the probability that he would defeat Mr. Coolidge, they have worked underground to keep him from getting the place. While the theory is not completely impossible we find ourselves unable to give it credence. Most of the Wall Street Republicans whom Mr. McAdoo accuses are sincerely convinced that Coolidge will win. Moreover, if they have any intelligence—and they have considerable—they know that any attempt on their part to dictate, by the use of money or moral pressure, the action of the Democratic party would almost certainly be discovered, with disastrous consequences. Finally, Mr. McAdoo has enough sincere foes inside the ranks of his party to account for all the hostility displayed against him. In our judgment the wicked-Republicans story should be placed with the wine-and-women-for-Al Smith tale as a natural campaign product not to be taken too seriously.

EUROPEAN correspondents are attaching great importance to the mid-July conference on the Dawes Plan at which the United States will be represented by Ambassador Kellogg. Lloyd George reflects what seems to be a general impression in the European capitals when he asserts that it will be the most important gathering since the war—one reason being of course that America is participating, and in the discussion of a plan in the creation of which Americans played a leading rôle. While we agree that there are signs of clearing in the European skies, it would be foolish to assume an air of fatuous optimism, or to overlook the grave difficulties which still lie in the way of an enduring peace. Painful experience has taught us in the past seven years that conferences can accomplish no more than the populations of the participating countries are ready to support. M. Herriot is showing better intentions toward Germany than his predecessor; and if it were left to him alone the Dawes Plan would doubtless be put into effect, speedily and completely. But M. Herriot's hold on the premiership is a precarious one. Only a few days ago the Socialists flatly deserted him on the question of credits for continuing the Ruhr occupation; and if he had not appealed to the Right he would have been defeated. He must tread warily or he will be jerked out of office. At the moment, a hue and cry is being raised lest the power of the Reparations Commission be weakened in favor of a new committee to execute the Dawes Plan. Herriot's very eagerness to explain that he has signed away no rights and that France is not bound in advance to accept the decisions of the coming conference, shows that he is completely aware of the insecurity of his position.

FOR the moment Mussolini has managed to ride out the storm caused by the kidnapping and murder of Deputy Matteotti; but his troubles are far from over. He will be forced to yield to the demand that the Fascist militia, now responsible only to him, shall be regularized as a part of the army; and in other ways he will be compelled to recede from the arbitrary and autocratic position he has held. Even the news which trickles through the censorship is sufficient to show that the Opposition is much stronger than any one would have supposed it could be a few weeks ago. Rumors of strife between armed bands of Fascisti and Communists are heard from a number of points in the provinces. There is still a possibility that the suppressed civil war will break out into extensive bloodshed at any minute.

SOME suggestion as to why Matteotti was unpopular with the Fascisti is contained in a letter which he wrote to the London Statist a short time before his death. Not only did he have evidence of wrongdoing on the part of important government officials, but he challenged the general record of the Mussolini régime itself. He charged that the undoubted improvement in Italy during the last year or two has been the result of economic forces with which the government has nothing to do. He denied that the government's expenditures have been diminished, though accounts have been juggled to make this seem to be the case. While it is true that the number of civil servants has been reduced by 5,000, the annual cost to the people is 100,000,000 lire larger than before. The cost of the railways is still 900,000,000 lire a year. An indictment of this sort is difficult to disprove; it is perhaps no wonder that the Fascisti resorted to their typical argument of violence in reply.

WHAT President Coolidge's plans for education are it is impossible to gather from his fourth of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

July speech to the National Education Association. There is an evil: the scattered and skimpy rural schools. Here is a measure of relief: a federal secretary of education who is, however, to interfere in no way with "local control and dignity." The relation between the relief and the evil remains a mystery. Everyone knows that rural schools are poor because the rural districts will not or cannot afford better, and that they can be improved only by the extension of help or the exertion of pressure from outside. But that is blatant interference and so is barred from political possibility. The proposed secretary is to improve the rural schools by "an attempt to recognize the importance of educational effort."

"IGNORANCE," said the President in his own modest tribute to education, "is the most fruitful source of poverty, vice and crime." This being true, to stamp out poverty and crime we have only to round up the vicious poor and forcibly induct them into a high-grade, expensive education. If, after a season at Groton or St. Mark's and four expansive years at Harvard or Princeton, there still remain in them any traces of a disposition to poverty or vice we can send them abroad for the grand tour. To the N. E. A. itself may well be delegated full responsibility for arranging the details of this salubrious program, since the education offered by our governmental penal institutions has been, in the past, so strangely inadequate.

THOUGH the result of the Mexican election will not be announced for some time, it is taken for granted that General Calles has won. He was the official Obregon candidate, and his success will mean a continuation of the policies which have dominated Mexico for the past few years. Much will be heard in the conservative American press as usual about Bolshevism; but even those with the most superficial knowledge of Mexican affairs are now in a position to realize the propaganda character of these reports. They may recall that it was the "Bolshevist's" Obregon régime which the United States government elected to support in opposition to the conservative de la Huerta revolution. The elements in Mexico which do not like the new constitution of 1917 or what is being done under it are numerous and powerful. But there are two sides to the question even though the average American hears only one of them.

The Meaning of the La Follette Candidacy

THE behavior of the Republican and Democratic conventions has vindicated the opinion of those progressives who did not anticipate on the part of either the two major parties any action which would render unnecessary the nomination of a progressive candidate. The Republicans were, of course, bound both by their candidate and their record to defy progressivism rather than to concede anything to it. But many progressives cherished hopes of some action or proclamation of faith by the Democratic party which would enable progressives to support its candidate and platform. The Democrats have done or said nothing to justify these hopes. They are not, like the Republicans, the blind and headstrong spokesmen of a single privileged class. If a progressive had to choose between the two major parties, he would be compelled to prefer the Democrats. But in carrying out the preference he would support a candidate who in the event of any conflict would be more of a Democrat than a progressive; and a succession of such choices would be disastrous to the progressive cause. For the Democratic party as now constituted is incapable of becoming the sincere and thorough-going agent of a progressive economic policy.

A progressive who believes that the Democratic party, as it now exists, can become the sincere and thorough-going spokesman and instrument of a progressive social policy must mean by the word "progressive" something different from that which the New Republic means. It is, of course, frequently assumed that any party which has not crystallized in opposition to economic and social experiments and which, like the Democratic, sometimes exhibits general sympathies with the point of view of the mass of the people, is entitled to be called progressive. The assumption might be correct in a country which was already tending under the influence of automatic economic causes and prevailing political traditions to move in the direction of constructive readjustments. But such is not the case with the United States. The economic movement of the American nation is still sucking the economic vitality out of the rural districts for the benefit of the industrialized cities. It is still concentrating the power which the industrial expansion creates in the hands of a comparatively small class. These economic tendencies will never be checked by a party which is as much disposed as is the Democracy to let economic tendencies have their own way, which contains so many beneficiaries of the existing movement and which could not become radically progressive without severe internal dissensions and the secession of so many of its existing followers. In the sense that progressivism is now politically and economically desirable, the Democracy cannot adopt the progressive point of view without being untrue to the traditions and false to the interest and convictions of a large and influential part of its membership.

For this reason we are glad that the Democrats have not in their platform strained themselves in order to appear more progressive than they really are. By so doing they would have caused many vot-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers who tend towards progressivism to hesitate and perhaps to choose the safer and more respectable variety which the Democrats offered for their consumption. As it is, the Democratic party stands where it should—in a middling position. Its candidate will compete for votes rather with Coolidge than with La Follette. He must seek election, not by trying to persuade hesitating progressives to prefer him to La Follette, but by trying to keep the habitual Democrats in line and to persuade hesitating Republicans that moderate conservatism is safer than the thorough-going variety. The Democrats have turned the disaffected vote over to La Follette. By not competing for it they have helped to bring about a more intelligible and intelligent discussion of the issues of the campaign. Such a discussion would not have taken place unless the American voter had a chance to choose among three candidates—one of whom stands for the domination of business in American politics, another of whom insists on thorough-going resistance to that domination, and the third of whom avoids the issue and seeks to lead his fellow countrymen along the virtuous but equivocal middle path.

The refusal of the Democrats to pretend to be more progressive than they really are leaves a comparatively clear field for Robert La Follette as the progressive candidate, and this deliverance will prove to be of immense advantage to the progressive agitation in this country. Progressivism, it cannot be too often insisted, has ceased to be a matter of good intentions, liberal ideas and empty or ambiguous public spirit. It has become of necessity the organized effort of the classes who live on the fruits of their own physical or intellectual labor to have their interests and outlook more thoroughly considered in the conduct of American business and politics. As long as the welfare of progressive policies is confided to well-intentioned and public-spirited members of the Democratic and Republican parties, no such consideration will take place. In the economy of the American party system it is the function of liberal Democrats and liberal Republicans to adopt and emasculate progressive policies and by rendering them harmless to render them also comparatively useless. This they have done again and again. In the course of the last fifty years so-called liberals or reformers have emasculated civil service reform, tariff reform, the anti-trust and anti-railroad agitations, conservation of natural resources and rural reconstruction. In so doing they may have under the circumstances performed a public service, but if they continue to be serviceable in the same way American government will soon break down under the pressure of unsolved problems. It is time to try another method. Certain classes in the community who are discriminated against by the existing conduct of American business and government must themselves try to seize enough power to compel the ruling classes to recognize their interests as groups.

An insurgent effort of this kind to create new centres and instruments of effective economic and political power cannot coalesce with the existing party organizations. Its success depends on its ability to break up the existing parties, to detach certain of their members and to undermine their morale. Progressivism in this sense is engaged in an irreconcilable conflict with Democracy and Republicanism. If it can create a national Farmer-Labor party as its political instrument, it will either destroy or else profoundly modify the two old parties. Republicanism has in the past derived its nourishment from a coalition between industry and agriculture which assumed that both interests were a matter of property rather than labor. The Democracy has been united on a territorial rather than on a functional basis. It has derived its nourishment rather from a combination of sections than a combination of economic interests. Neither of these coalitions can survive in their traditional form if Farmer-Labor progressivism establishes itself as a political organization which is strong enough to challenge the existing two-party monopoly of power. It will be literally impossible to operate the American government with three parties, no one of which can command a majority. It will be impossible to keep alive the pretenses and the propaganda on which the old parties have lived if Farmer-Labor agitators can persuade American workers to organize politically and economically for the purpose of participating in the conduct of American business and government. A permanent Farmer-Labor party would compel the conservative elements in the two older parties to combine against it.

In the present campaign Senator La Follette's personality counts for quite as much voting strength as do the insurgent economic groups which are supporting his candidacy. As yet there is no national and authentic Farmer-Labor party. The insurrectionary agitation in the West would not, if it could not count on La Follette's leadership, have very much chance of being politically effective. Senator Borah is probably the only other possible candidate who might poll enough votes to compromise the election of the Democratic and Republican nominees. But this fact, although important, does not attenuate the probably permanent underlying significance of the present demonstration. The La Follette candidacy has only one ultimate justification. It is a necessary introduction to the formation of a third party which is intended, like the British Labor party, to represent those economic groups which for one cause or another have reason to be dissatisfied with the existing distribution of political and economic power. With Senator La Follette as their candidate the progressive members of the farmer and labor groups have a chance of forcing their latent power on public attention by preventing the return of a majority in the electoral college for either the Republican or Democratic candidate. If they can accomplish this result and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at the same time poll a substantial minority of the vote in the states like Illinois, New York, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts, they will have scored the kind of success which will force incredulous and faint-hearted farmers and laborers to believe in the possibility of an insurgent third party and put the fear of God into the hearts of the business men and politicians.

Whether such a third party will permanently challenge the monopoly of the older parties is, of course, a matter of speculation; but certainly if a Farmer-Labor progressive party does not emerge from the wrecks of the older parties the American nation will soon have small reason to boast of its achievements in the art of self-government. There is one service which a progressive party which is strong enough to challenge the existing bi-partisan monopoly may perform for its older rivals. It may force them to reconsider their existing organization, methods, leaders and traditions and so to save their lives. For unless they do reconsider their habits and outlook they will soon have to face a more serious insurrection than that which any third party is capable of starting. They will face the embittered disaffection of millions of American citizens who no longer believe in political remedies for their discomforts and will look toward the alternative of direct action. The Democratic and Republican parties are showing themselves incapable of formulating and passing the kind of progressive economic legislation which is needed to restore the balance and renew the energy of American economic life. If they retain their existing monopoly in the exercise of political power and continue to use it as they have done, the pretentious absurdity of their claim to be masters in the art of democratic government will have been fatally exposed but at the same time no political alternative will have been provided. In that event would not disaffected America be tempted to fall back on violence and to experiment once more with class or sectional warfare? The La Follette candidacy is the beginning of an attempt to supply an alternative.

The Approaching Conflict

IN this issue of the New Republic Mr. Sisley Huddleston pointedly calls attention to what is probably the subject of greatest immediate importance in the world today—the practically unabated rancor and enmity between France and Germany. During the past few months Americans have usually assumed that the publication and acceptance of the Dawes Report and the somewhat milder attitude of the new French government towards Germany were by way of removing the causes of the enmity between the two peoples and of assuaging their embittered feelings. Mr. Huddleston challenges this assumption. The Dawes Report is still very far from being placed in operation, and at best it is only an introduction to a sufficiently thoroughgoing attempt to improve the relations between the two countries. In so far as it is honestly tried out, it should succeed in extricating from the German economic system a large volume of reparations; but it will not avail to appease the genuine grievances of the German people nor to reconcile them to a much longer continuation of their existing and prospective humiliation and ill-treatment. American, and to a large extent, British and neutral public opinion wholly fails to take sufficient account of the reality and the intensity of these German grievances.

Never since the beginning of the European system of nationalities and international comity has one country offered graver cause of offense to another than France offered to Germany by the invasion of the Ruhr. If the tearing away of Alsace and Lorraine from the political unit with which they had long been associated constituted in 1871 an unhealable wound in Europe and a justifiable cause of French hostility towards Germany what shall we say of the violation of the Ruhr? It was an act of war in time of peace, in defiance, so the Germans and the British claimed, of the provisions of a treaty which had just been concluded—a treaty, moreover, of unexampled severity, in distinct violation of the terms on which Germany surrendered, and extorted from her by the threat of military invasion and torture by starvation. It added immeasurably to the rage and chagrin of Germany that in spite of her signature of the treaty she suffered both of these penalties as a consequence of the occupation of the Ruhr.

Moreover, the occupation itself was carried out with a cynical indifference to any possible accommodation with the inhabitants of the seized area, and at times with a savagery which seemed merely wanton. Abhorrent as is a policy of hostages and reprisals which at times culminates in atrocities, such as Germany inflicted on Belgium, it is at least understandable as a military measure, subject to abuse in the panic and disorganization of war. The occupation of the Ruhr occurred in time of peace and in a district which had been thoroughly disarmed. The invaders had nothing to fear but their own consciences. Yet for needless, meaningless, heartless brutality on their part it would be difficult to find a parallel. The Germans deported civilians from the territory occupied by them, but not in the whole course of the war did the number deported reach the total of the deportations by the French from the Ruhr; nor did they send their deportees to remote and unhealthful regions which meant death to all but the strongest. They imprisoned men and women under conditions which were terrible enough, but which did not equal in horror those reported in the French prisons by Miss Pye, and other English observers. They put to death by court martial and by more summary methods those whom they deemed dangerous to their authority, but we do not constantly hear of Belgians or French

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being shot in cold blood for stopping in the street to converse or for ill-timed laughter. Discount atrocities in the Ruhr according to the severest formula which we have learned to apply in such matters, and there is much in the evidence of eye-witnesses, English and Swedish, to support the awful hypothesis that the French invasion was carried out with a definite purpose of making any complete reconciliation between the French and German peoples permanently impossible. That will certainly tend to be its result unless European and American public opinion comes to understand (and act on the understanding) that the devastation of Germany since the end of the war is beginning to equal the devastation of France during the war.

As the New Republic has frequently pointed out, the new government of France which we like to acclaim as liberal is placed in a terrible quandary by the legacy of hate which it has inherited from the policy of M. Poincaré. Even though the French liberals really desire a reconciliation, how can they reconcile a France which still considers itself aggrieved and threatened with an exasperated, enraged, desperate Germany which is fully convinced that France is seeking its extinction as a nation? The French liberals themselves will not agree to evacuate the Ruhr unless they are compensated for the act of magnanimity while the Germans will eventually find some means of repudiating penalties to which they have consented only as a necessary means of delivering themselves from outrage. The danger has always been that the Germans will be driven by their exasperation and desperation into armed resistance. For some months liberals all over the world have assumed that the Dawes Report had shut the door on the possible occurrence of such a terrible calamity. Mr. Huddleston thinks not, and he is probably right. Certainly nothing has been done as yet to assuage the exasperation and the desperation of the German people.

In the opinion of our correspondent hostilities between Germany and France may break out on any one of many lines of faultage in the stratification of Europe determined by the Treaty. For certain of these arrangements the American experts whom Mr. Wilson took with him to Paris bear the chief responsibility—which was in part doubtless thrust upon them by the astuteness of their collaborators. The Polish Corridor, which Mr. Huddleston mentions as a proximate and certain cause of upheaval, is understood to be the conception of the American professor, R. H. Lord. For the terms on which the Saar Valley was turned over to France and which are a standing provocation to war between the two countries, Professor C. H. Haskins claims the credit. A well authenticated anecdote represents the American expert on the Italian-Austrian boundary sitting by in helpless horror while Mr. Wilson promised the South Tyrol to Signor Orlando. For the crowning achievement of the American peacemakers, the swelling of the reparations by the inclusion of pensions, we have to thank General Smuts and President Wilson himself. And quite apart from all such detail the gross fact remains that the United States furnished the economic and military force which was employed to alter the face of Europe, without taking the most elementary precautions to insure the limitation of that force to the objects for which we ostensibly made war and Germany accepted peace.

It is worth while to recall these unpleasant facts not in order to rub them in but in order to remind Americans of the American share in the responsibility for the approaching conflict, and in order to indicate the nature of the remedy. If war is to be avoided there must be a resettlement of Europe, which will restore independence to Germany and to which the Germans can consent without national self-stultification. Otherwise the time will undoubtedly come when Germany will prefer to fight even a hopeless war than to submit to a continuation of her present humiliation and ill-treatment. The only political agency which is capable of bringing about a resettlement of Europe is a general conference. Since Mr. Lloyd George's failure at Genoa in 1922, the idea of such a conference has seemed futile, but now there are indications that the present British Prime Minister is considering whether he cannot renew the experiment. He would undoubtedly do something of the kind if he could feel sure of American support, but unfortunately he cannot obtain this assurance from either the Democratic or Republican parties. The part of American public opinion which is most concerned about our responsibility in Europe has usually been indifferent to the grievances of Germany and the indispensability of a general resettlement. At present it is chiefly the Americans who during the war were most apprehensive that military success would mean the failure of the Wilson political program—it is chiefly these Americans who are aware of how inevitable the approaching European conflict is becoming and how only it can be prevented. Not the Republican or Democratic but the La Follette platform demands that the government of the United States participate in negotiations to revise the Treaty of Versailles in accordance with the terms of the Armistice—the only course compatible with the good faith of this country and the peace of the world.

Taxes and Large Incomes

THE Treasury Department of the United States has just issued its report on the statistics of personal income returns for the year 1922. It relegates some of Secretary Mellon's statements in the famous Green letter and in his book, "Taxation: The People's Business," to the realm of amateur statistics. There we had a hasty conclusion concerning the effect of high surtaxes upon the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

number of large incomes reported; here we have the facts, and they show how utterly faulty were those conclusions.

When Mr. Mellon wrote his letter to Chairman Green the latest available statistics were those for 1921. In that year only 246 people had reported incomes over $300,000; in 1920 there had been 395; and in 1919 there had been 679. The conclusion drawn was that this source of revenue was gradually drying up, and that the high rates on large incomes defeated the very purpose for which they were levied. A reduction in surtaxes was, therefore, the only way of preserving the incomes of the rich as a source of contributions to the government.

Those who had analyzed the figures of 1921 and had studied the sources from which incomes were derived in that year knew that the decline in their number in 1920 and 1921 was due, not primarily to high tax rates, but rather to industrial depression, falling prices, and a declining market for stocks and bonds. This explanation appeared in an article in the New Republic in the issue of June 20, 1923. "The reason for this decline of income in the larger groups is to be found for the most part in the losses which were suffered on the sale of stocks, bonds, and real estate, and in a failure to take gains which might have been taken. The revenue act reducing the maximum rates on surtaxes to fifty percent was enacted into law in November, 1921. Its passage had been expected for some months. It was desirable, therefore, to take all possible losses before the close of the calendar year 1921; and opportunities for taking losses were abundant during that year. The year 1922, with its rising security markets, should once more see the incomes in the upper ranges greatly increased. Indeed, the internal revenue collections of income taxes show that this is exactly what has occurred. The normal and surtaxes paid on account of incomes received during the year 1922 will exceed $850,000,000."

Now that we have the facts from the Treasury, we find that the incomes above $300,000 increased in number from 246 in 1921 to 537 in 1922; and the taxes collected from all incomes amounted to $861,057,308. The total income reported by these large taxpayers increased from $153,534,305 in 1921 to $365,729,746 in 1922. There is every likelihood that the statistics for 1923, when they appear a year hence, will show that the large incomes reported in that year exceeded even those of 1919.

It seems a pity that the Treasury did not take the trouble to discover this information last November and give it to Congress and the people. It would have been a relatively small task to sort out these 537 incomes of $300,000 and over and compile them. In that case we should have had the facts to go on. That much at least the country had the right to expect from the Treasury.

The sources from which these large incomes are derived are as interesting and significant as the fact of their increase. The income derived from dividends and interest on investments increased from $155,370,228 to $242,499,524. This is higher than in 1920. Even in 1919, when there were 679 people reporting incomes of $300,000 and over, the income from these sources was only $314,984,884.

The average income received by each one of these large taxpayers from interest and dividends is practically as large in 1922 as it was in 1919. The average interest has decreased from $100,000 to $75,000, but the average dividends received are higher in 1922 than they were in 1919. This should dispose pretty effectively of the argument that the surtaxes had by 1922 driven capital out of industrial investments and into tax-exempt securities.

The great increase in these higher incomes is in profits from the sale of real estate, stocks and bonds. This had amounted to $55,144,479 in 1919; it was less than $10,000,000 in 1920; and less than $2,500,000 in 1921. By 1922 it had risen to $125,639,900. The decline of incomes in 1921 had been due to the absence of speculative profits, and not to the shifting into tax-exempts. Nor do the mere figures of speculative profits tell the whole story. These are not the net result of all speculative operations, profitable and unprofitable, combined. The amounts shown by the Treasury as gains are positive gain items reported. Wherever schedules within the returns show net losses, such losses are included in General Deductions. Thus if A makes a speculative gain of $50,000, and B suffers speculative losses of $40,000, the resultant showing of profits from sale of real estate, stocks, and bonds, in the Treasury's table, will be not $10,000 but $50,000. B's loss of $40,000 is thrown into General Deductions, with a number of other items. Not only were speculative profits larger in 1922, but speculative losses were much smaller. As a consequence the number of personal incomes increased in the upper income ranges.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1924, IN THE U. S., BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., INC., 421 WEST 21ST ST., NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRES., ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS.,
DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON R. M. LOVETT STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAWNEY
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS, CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"La Follette for President!"

THE Rotarians are gathering outside of the Hotel Statler ballroom, receiving their buttons and pinning them on, shaking hands, slapping backs, tearing the cordial air with a loud "Hello, Bill" and a fraternal "Well, well, Jack!" In a few minutes food and the twangs of a Hawaiian orchestra will drown the hum of their omnivorous good-will. On the same mezzanine floor, luxuriously dedicated to whist clubs, palms, meetings of the Ohio Hairdressers' Association, soft carpets and lonely ladies in deep armchairs, are also men obviously neither hairdressers nor Rotarians—men with care-worn hats and broadbrimmed faces, anxious looking men, or tired, or lean, or fearless, or bitter under a burden of hopes deferred, or stolid with the stolidity of a hundred lost battles; far-eyed, wrinkle-browed, leather-cheeked with a spiritual tan earned after long years of pursuing life, liberty and happiness through labor meetings and convention halls. Delegates to the Conference for Progressive Political Action ought to look like this, and so they do—at least such of them as are immediately distinguishable from the Rotarians with whom they mingle.

But this generous figure, and that contented eye, and those docile, satisfactory backs in the corner—do they belong to Rotarians or to delegates? The conscience-marked face on the right, and the bow-windowed Bacchus talking to him, do they denote boosters for La Follette or just plain Boosters? Fortunately this guessing game, dangerous to an observer who comes to Cleveland predisposed toward the one and prejudiced against the other, is cut short by the withdrawal of the Rotarians behind doors whence issue, shortly, the sounds of the Star Spangled Banner. "Sung for our benefit?", ask the delegates, who do not rise nor are disturbed in their discussion of what this conference ought to do.

They agree that the only thing that can happen is what ought to happen. They will unite in supporting La Follette's independent candidacy on his own platform, and let plans for a third party await the result of the election. They are here to tell a leader that they will follow him, rather than an old party or any new one; without him, they might be tempted to form a new party, without him, they might try to do so and fail. The many different men here are ready to accept a one-man show.

The one man being absent, and gatherings of many men being poor translations of their individual wills and tempers, this show will hardly be dramatic or inspiring or in any way seem as important as the bare fact of its meeting.

Down past the hot-dog parlors and the vulcanizing stores on this leaden Fourth of July, there are some thousand men and a few women, squared off by aisles in bareheaded regiments levelled away to empty seats in the background. Above them some two thousand more spectators in the galleries cling like insects to the sides of a steep horseshoe. They face, stretched across the back of the platform, an American flag of no mean acreage, while a chorus sings new words of political promise to old patriotic or sentimental tunes. Overhead the darkened roof is the underside of a giant bridge, whose multiple ribs and spans glow with subtle illumination, now blue, now red, now arctic, now infernal. What a setting, in this dim cave of fire or ice, for that final novelty which shall set men free.

But the electric color fades into daylight, the delegates' faces become visible, and words break faintly through the tune of Maryland, My Maryland:

His mind is wise, his courage vast,
La Follette, yes, La Follette;
In nothing can he be outclassed—
La Follette, yes, La Follette.

Shall we take the words or the stirring old tune as symbolic of this convention? If we take both together, we shall not be much out of the way. And so too must we consider the men, giving due weight to that mass of things unsaid hiding within attentive delegates, watching them as much as their more vocal leaders.

The most vocal of these leaders is William H. Johnston, head of the machinists, and chairman of this conference, whose keynote speech—later alluded to as "the greatest keynote speech ever heard in any convention"—he reads as if for the first time, breaking his sentences in the wrong place, pushing them violently through the applause, repeating them with a "That's good, I'll say it again," rough riding them, with a shaking menacing finger, with the inevitable long-drawn "gre-e-at" of all politicians, with sudden complacent clasping of the hands together. In his handling of the conference this small, bald, short-armed, well-fed figure is alternately canny, severe, genial, domineering and confused. When he once in a while moves out of range of the amplifiers, the instantly shrunken voice gives the impression of a man suddenly fallen off his stilts.

He is the recurring punctuation mark between long stretches of every known variety of oratory. According to each speaker the seriousness of the occasion seems very near or very far away. Senator Shipstead brings it near, with a kind of mystical sternness, a mellowed bitterness in his biting accent and tall, rigid figure. By contrast with him Arthur E. Holder, secretary of the conference, is the perfect old-time spell-binder, winding, with evident enjoyment, his audience up to a height of phraseology, hopeful or denunciatory, from which he lets them fall, at the appointed moment, into a splash of applause. Such a talent could easily, by skilful ris-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing inflections and accelerated gestures, make an audience cheer the alphabet. Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch is an even superior spell-binder, with perhaps more fire and less fireworks. For natural, sincere eloquence, the negro William Pickens was perhaps the best of the three, a gallant and rousing figure. The delegates cheered him wildly; they cheered Senator Lynn Frazier's blunt honest, empty oratory, they listened carefully to the verses—quatrains, some of them—of Edwin Markham.

But all these men belong in the convention picture. Andy Furuseth, of the Seamen's Union, does not. What ancient world of privation and suffering he belongs to it would, in this group of men upon whom their battles have left more wrinkles than scars, be hard to say. Something of the saint, something of Daniel Boone, lean, wild, solitary, hollow-cheeked, ancestral. Soon this lost eagle, ascetic, time and trouble-bitten, leaves the platform, with his bell-bottomed trousers flapping about his ankles.

The only other truly original figure is that of Peter Witt, a member of the Cleveland City Council, well-known as a fighter who doesn't care a damn what he says about anybody. He strikes a wholesomely acid note in this assembly so far given over to wholehearted praise or blame—"Try to tell the truth—but you'll find out before this campaign is over that the Yokels and the Babbitts don't take kindly to it." But even he does not continue in that vein, and soon is saying something about ". . . for forty years four square . . ."

While Witt's ability is evident, little of what he says would tell us that John W. Nelson was one of the most level-headed of Congressmen. From a beginning suitable to the occasion he wanders off into dreary historical deserts, without Sphinx or Pyramid, of historical Wisconsin progressivism.

Time slows its step, daylight is saddened, the delegates huddle in their chairs, the members of the press draw aimless pictures. Across the street a Magnavox radio is retelling the old old story of Madison Square Garden, "Alabama—twenty-four votes—for Oscar W. Underwood." The eye wanders with the mind, brushing together the scraps and details of which this conference is made, the pictures of Washington and La Follette, side by side, two feet by four, the chorus resting from

> 'Twas a long, long trail that led us
> Unto the party of our dreams.

We see Robert Minor, drawing on hotel stationery cartoons of men who have no use for the revolution. We try to find among the delegates those who are most probably members of the District of Columbia League of American Inventors. We remember the announcement that a rosary had been found on the floor of the hall. We think of the corridors of the Statler when the day's session is over, and all these men who have been silent, or voted Aye or No, or cheered, or stood up and waved for La Follette are talking together with their own voices and their own minds. Approach any one of them, some thick-set, fearless, capable, healthy railroad union delegate perhaps, and soon what a stream of old battles will be fought over while you listen. These men are not just delegates; almost every one of them has, locked up in his stocky, unassuming frame, some fragment of the long fight for an eight-hour day, or free speech, or the referendum, or against the bosses, or against poverty, or tyranny great or little. The largest proportion of the men is from the railroad unions. There are few farmers—"they couldn't come because they are broke," says Lynn Frazier. There are coöperators, and members of all sorts of political leagues, and some hundred Socialists, who vote "aye" to the business of this conference, but not too happily. There are housewives here, and clip-haired women, very few of them, with opinions burning in their eyes, and veterans of Coxey's army, and well-dressed, neat-speeched liberals, and radical youngsters who know Roberts' Rules of Order backward and make trouble for the chairman, and girls in knickers, and white-bearded Populists, and a very thin scattering of obvious cranks. But if you go out and watch the delegates having their group picture taken, these picturesque fractions sink out of sight in a sea of broad-faced, heavy limbed, determined, well-centred labor union men.

They are not as wild as their cheers for La Follette. They stand and wave, but take them aside and they will tell you that their union is going to spend its money in its own way. They will talk sense to you and then go back and cheer speeches sprinkled with:

> Encroachment of the powerful few upon the right of the many . . . Years ago James Russell Lowell said . . . a President who will give us an American administration . . . from ocean to ocean and from the Lakes to the Gulf . . . For a man who . . . a man who . . . the Little Giant of the West . . .

As well try to judge these men by the words they listen to as a great engine by its puff of steam.

The Little Giant is not here, but his picture, and his will and words rule the conference almost as much as if he were. He could hardly have roused more enthusiasm in person than the reading of his message. To be sure, it was read by his son, Bob, Jr., with an irresistibly dramatic, but untheatrical fervor which made many think that the son has inherited a greater share of his father's passionate courage than is needed for merely ordinary success. The La Follette platform, which the conference adopted whole, seemed from their reception of it to be exactly what they wanted. They will continue to want these things and to fight against others whether he leads them successfully or not.

By a lucky accident here is a man who by virtue of personality, of courage and integrity, can force men to unite without that third party which they might find so hard to build alone. In a sense, since they have now united for a common purpose, however obvious and simple, their third party is here, if only because they have found some common ground to stand on.

ROBERT LITTELL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is it War or Peace in Europe?

IS it peace at last in Europe? Or are the gloomy prophets who forsee another war at no distant date justified in their warnings? There can be no question of greater importance than this.

Unfortunately it is one which cannot be answered dogmatically. One has definitely the impression that Europe is settling down, and that peace (which may or may not be the synonym of prosperity) will be achieved before the year is out. One clings to this belief because one realizes that if we are again disappointed the alternative swings clearly into view.

France and Germany, who still perpetuate the last of the great international feuds of the continent, cannot go on glaring at each other for much longer without events taking one path or the other. The cross-roads will quickly be reached, if they are not reached already.

What truth is there then in the frequent assertions which are made not only in cheap sensational newspapers, but in the most serious organs, that Germany is deliberately preparing for another struggle which she realizes to be inevitable with France? This cry, that Germany contemplates a war of revenge, has been used over and over again in France to prevent an agreement. One cannot but suspect that it has been most improperly used merely as a political weapon, and that the Bloc National, which is now defeated, owed much of its strength to the scares which it could raise whenever nationalism was shaken. The Bloc National cried "Wolf" too often, and in the end the country declined to trouble itself about the so-called German peril.

In the fable, it was precisely at this moment, when nobody paid any more attention to the cries of "Wolf," that the danger manifested itself. Will it be so in the international domain? I have had some recent opportunities of ascertaining—as far as it is possible to ascertain—the truth, and propose to marshal the facts.

In France, with the advent of M. Herriot as Prime Minister and the election of M. Doumergue in the place of M. Millerand as President of the republic, the situation has in important respects changed. But it has not changed so completely as, in their desire to generalize, the newspapers have represented. I have already made it clear that the vote in the country at the last elections was not materially different from that of 1919, but it was sufficiently different not only to give the parties of the Left the advantage in Parliament, but also to determine a new spirit, a spirit of peace, a spirit which renders possible a friendly arrangement not only with England but with Germany, and the application of the Dawes report.

Nevertheless the French are vigilant. The Bloc des Gauches will not have matters its own way; it indeed sustained a defeat when M. Doumergue was sent to the Elysée instead of M. Painlevé. M. Doumergue may be regarded as in the direct line of succession to M. Poincaré. It was M. Poincaré who enabled him to reach, in the last Parliament, the Presidency of the Senate, which is a stepping-stone to the Presidency of the republic. M. Doumergue shares M. Poincaré's views on foreign affairs. It is not unfair to say that he is his friend and even disciple. His first message to Parliament insisted on the need of security. In spite of the new majority in the Chamber, the President declared that France will not surrender her forces, nor her right of control over a vanquished enemy who appears to be preparing its "revanche."

M. Herriot himself, in spite of the fact that normally he would rely upon the support of the Socialists, chose as his War Minister, a general. This in itself is an unusual step, but when the general calls himself Nollet, the significance of his choice cannot be mistaken. General Nollet, as the Chief of the Interallied Mission of Military Control in Germany, is the man who more than any other Frenchman has had opportunities of judging whether Germany is or is not arming. His presence at the War Office denotes that France is prepared to run no risks, and that M. Herriot is convinced that there is a certain possibility of trouble arising. He has, indeed, clearly indicated this in his own statements, and when the verbiage which lays stress on the desire for concord is swept away, there emerges an obvious doubt in the goodwill of Germany.

M. Herriot thus seemed to give point to the statements which were freely made in the press of all the European countries regarding the prospect of a new German challenge. This commentator lays it down with an air of authority, that Germany will in ten years be able to repudiate her engagements and that a fresh clash will then come. This other commentator affirms that in six months Germany will be able, if she thinks the moment opportune, to sustain a defensive war and to inform the Allies that if they wish to obtain anything from her they must come and fetch it.

Between these extremes there are intermediate speculations. One American observer in the Chicago Daily News—which can hardly be accused of systematic sensationalism—is persuaded after an investigation in Germany and conversations with many leading men, that it is only a question of time for Germany to be ready to throw down the glove. In England the Daily Mail put forward precise figures. It is difficult to see from what authentic source they could have been obtained.

The final report of General Nollet in his capacity

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Allied Commissioner, was somewhat alarming. In governmental circles, although there is agreement with the British suggestion that as soon as possible the task of supervising the disarmament of Germany shall be handed over to the League of Nations, there is some fear that the supervision of the League will be ineffective and illusory. How, indeed, if the Allied Commission has been unable to prevent Germany from setting up the cadres of an army which may number at need four millions or even six millions, can the League with its present constitution and limited powers hope to check the movement? But the control of the League is put forward as eventual and, it may be, remote. It is for the Allies first to satisfy themselves. The proposal, therefore, is not as yet a very solid proposal.

M. Herriot has referred to the evasions practised by Germany after Tilsit, and although historical analogies are often misleading and the conditions have changed, there is beyond doubt a widespread conviction that Germany needs watching now more than ever. It should be pointed out that if Germany has become more Nationalist, and if the supervision of the Allies appears to have failed, it is largely because the Interallied Mission has been unable to fulfil its functions since and because of the occupation of the Ruhr.

M. Poincaré concentrated his attention upon the Ruhr. With his single-track mind he was not sufficiently aware that the Ruhr occupation not only intensified the hatred of Germany for France, but deprived France of means of action outside the Ruhr. Instead of the Ruhr occupation giving France the security which she sought, it actually made her position less secure. For as any military man would agree, at a given moment Germany could sweep aside the armies of occupation if she were prepared to accept the consequences. In the event of war the Ruhr would be a trap; its occupation would serve no purpose whatever. This has, I understand, been the opinion of distinguished soldiers from the beginning, and it is hard therefore to appreciate the false sense of security which France has experienced. While M. Poincaré was devoting his attention to the Ruhr, General Nollet was complaining bitterly that in the incipient state of hostilities that was produced, he was altogether unable to exercise his authority in Germany, and his investigations were practically suspended. They have been suspended for over eighteen months, and much may have happened during that period.

In the highest circles I am informed that it is the view of the authorities that the most dangerous point is the Polish Corridor to Danzig. This Corridor cuts Germany into two, and across the Corridor Germans regard each other. It offers a perpetual temptation; a violation of the agreement is possible at any moment. It may be a violation that is not intended by responsible Germans, but once it is accomplished, the consequences may be grave. M. Poincaré himself is particularly anxious about this possibility for, as he admitted to me in conversation, France could hardly sit with folded arms if once the Corridor were menaced.

There are also the frontiers in the East which are ill conceived, and which sooner or later may lead to strife between Poland and Germany. Germany, it is asserted, will not be so naïve as to attack France directly, but war may begin in many other ways. Recently I had a talk with an exceedingly distinguished German in Paris—a German who is beyond question pacific in intention. He belongs to those democratic elements to which M. Herriot makes his appeal. He was frankly alarmed at the situation, for in his opinion war would be an exceedingly bad thing for Germany. He denied that Germany was arming, and he considered that Germany must lose. For the sake of his own country, therefore, he wished for peace. While admitting that there was some illegal drilling, and perhaps a certain number of hidden guns and munitions, he assured me that no sensible man could suppose that Germany is really in a position to fight, or will be for many years to come. *The tragic thing is not that Germany is prepared for war, but that Germany is altogether unprepared but is nevertheless at the mercy of the smallest incident.*

Safety can only be found in a complete revision of the Treaty of Versailles, for while the present political arrangements endure, there is danger. The Dawes Report is helpful but it is not enough. Even though it were accepted all round and applied, it would merely settle the financial arrangements between the Allies and Germany; the political relations are infinitely more important. The Dawes Report is a broom which may sweep away the rubbish accumulated on the door-step—to use his phrase—and after the reparation dispute has been disposed of, then a political settlement may be obtained.

The upshot of it all is that there is still much work to be done before Europe is secure. French diplomacy made what may prove to be a fatal mistake in endeavoring to draw Poland into the orbit of France, and to set Poland and Germany at loggerheads. Marshal Pilsudski, the first President of the Polish republic, was—to his credit be it said—altogether opposed to the policy which was followed. He realized the need of an understanding between Germany and Poland if Poland was to live. France cannot assure safety to Poland, and Poland may be lost in espousing the cause of France. She must come to terms with Germany. An economic treaty which would give Poland access to the sea—whether at Danzig or elsewhere, as Germany originally proposed—would be far better than this perilous Corridor.

A British officer who, I believe, expresses the views of Marshal Foch, pooh-poohed the idea that Germany was manufacturing munitions on a large scale. There is no need of munitions on a large scale, to begin with. It is folly to manufacture

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them. Sensible countries—that is to say, sensible from the military point of view—are adopting different methods. Munitions become obsolete almost at once. It is useless to heap them up, for when they are wanted they will be worthless. Attention is therefore being paid to experiments. The sensible countries are keeping up-to-date with the military developments, and they are taking such measures as will enable them, at a moment's notice, to transform ordinary factories into munition factories which can turn out large quantities of guns and munitions quickly. Obviously Germany, too, may be experimenting, may be ready to mobilize her factories as well as her armies—and Nationalism is growing within the Reich.

Unless Europe, therefore, is to march straight to disaster, it is imperative that there should be not only an agreement on the reparations question and the application of the Dawes Report, but that this *financial settlement shall be followed by a great European conference at which there will be a general revision of the decisions of Versailles—a revision which Germany will accept.*

The initial blunder was to attempt to impose peace upon Germany. Peace cannot be imposed, it can only be agreed upon. That is why, in calling attention to the possibility of another war in Europe, I am not in any way joining my voice to that of the scaremongers, but on the contrary represent this possibility in order that while there is yet time the necessary steps may be taken to improve the relations of European peoples, which were rendered impossible by the unpardonable Treaty of Versailles. On whether France and England, besides Germany, are prepared for this revision within the next year or so depend the possibilities of peace and war.

Paris. SISLEY HUDDLESTON.

Sublimation

OVER in the cot on the other side of the room some one stirred. I knew it must be 41 A. That was what the nurses called her.

"41 A is off soft diet," I had heard one of them shout down the dumbwaiter in the hall. "Send her up a chop."

My nose had traced the approach of the chop and its delivery at the cot across the room.

"41 A is ringing."

"41 A wants a drink of water."

In a detached, nebulous state, I had been aware of 41 A for some hours. Now I realized that she had propped herself up on one elbow and was looking at me. It would be only courteous to return the look. I considered. So much easier to lie perfectly still on one's back and gaze straight up at white-washed walls slanting into white-washed ceiling like the background of a cubistic picture! But I would make an effort. I would turn my head. I was curious to see my room-mate.

She was a girl of perhaps twenty with a lean, sallow face, pointed chin cupped in the palm of a thin, long-fingered hand; mouse-colored hair, eyes that might be blue or brown. She returned my look without moving an eyelash.

"Say," she asked without further introduction, "Is yours a girl or a boy?"

"A girl," I answered. "Which is your baby?"

"A boy. Dead. Born dead," said 41 A.

I tried to say something and couldn't. To have waited through those months of sickness and heaviness, dreaming of a baby, making him tiny clothes, all but feeling him close, warm in one's arms; to have fought through the wild red agony of birth and to have at the end—a tiny thing that did not move or cry—dead—born dead.—Oh! what words were there to say to that girl who lay across the room?

We lay in utter silence.

Then the prop of her elbow seemed suddenly to give way, and 41 A disappeared among a mound of bedclothes. . . .

Visitors might come between six and nine, but, that evening, 41 A had none. Her eyes never left the door, but no one came for her. When a man's figure darkened the doorway, she rose up eagerly on one elbow, but tumbled back petulantly when he proved to be my husband. At quarter to nine she gave up hope.

"Guess my man ain't comin'," she confided. "I know where he is. He's to the fights. Always goes to the fights on Tuesday nights, I'd ought'a remembered. Other nights he's real good about comin' here. I hadn't ought'a expected him tonight when there's the fights."

The next day I heard more about her man. Beside being a devotee of boxing-bouts, he was a daredevil hero who climbed sky-high posts and tossed live wires about with one hand. He made a living by tossing live wires—wasn't he a lineman? Her man—"Bill"—was also the kindest and best of husbands. He had washed dishes for her when she was sick and given her an imitation ivory manicure set for Christmas. All day, 41 A added, at intervals, to the legend of "Bill," her man. It was plain that, after losing her baby, she had set about transferring all the love she had ready for her child to Bill. She would not let herself miss the baby. She would not speak about the baby. She had Bill.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"And that is what they call 'sublimation,'" I thought. "I wonder if it really works!"

I began to fear for Bill even before he came. He strolled in very red and uncomfortable at half-past eight that evening. He was a medium-sized boy with a rough, but agreeable face, ill at ease in his best clothes. He put his hat on the bed and sat down beside his wife. They exchanged no greetings, and yet, they were evidently glad to see each other.

"Where was you last night?" 41 A questioned.

"To the fights."

"Great place to be when your wife is sick in the horspital."

I hoped Bill knew as 41 A knew and I knew, that she didn't mean to say it, that she attacked him only to cover her tremendous joy at seeing him again.

"Say, you know I always go to the fights Tuesday nights," Bill came back.

Silence.

41 A moved restlessly. All day long she had waited for her man to come. And as she waited she had been endowing him with romance with all the qualities of a young god. And now here he was, awkward in his best clothes, tired after a long day's work, blind to her mood, unable to play the romantic rôle she expected of him.

41 A's evil genius suggested another tack.

"Is my aunt cookin' your meals?" she asked.

"Yep, and, say, we had a pie."

"What kind of a pie?" the girl demanded fiercely.

"Apple pie."

"Did she use up those apples I was savin'?" The face of 41 A was white and set.

"Sure," Bill admitted. "They wouldn't 'a kep' till you got back."

"Them was my apples," the girl told him angrily. "She had no business to use 'em."

"Say, don't be foolish."

"I ain't foolish. You oughtn't to 'a let her have 'em.—Was the pie any good?"

"Fine!" Bill beamed.

"Better an' mine, I suppose?"

"Say, what you so touchy about?" the man demanded.

"*Was it?*" The girl's long, thin hand reached out and caught him by the sleeve. "Say, was it?"

"No, it warn't," he told her sullenly. "What's the matter with you?"

41 A fell back among her pillows. But it was not long before she was up again berating her man on some other trivial pretext. At last he grew angry.

"I ain't a' comin', if you're goin' to pick on me all the time," he said to her. "Guess I'll go to the lodge instead of comin' here tomorrow night."

They were quarreling. 41 A was in tears. Best to shut one's eyes and trv to drift away from it all and waken only to see them "make up." They kissed as though it were an illicit act. They were afraid the nurse might see them. I caught the sound of a whisper and a girl's laugh. Another kiss, and her man, Bill, was gone.

"Bill ain't comin' tonight," she told me gaily in the morning. "He's goin' to the lodge. He didn't want to go, but I says he must. 'A fellar has to go with fellars and not always be hangin' 'round his wife,' I says."

She was all devotion, all self-sacrifice, all maternal. Her mood continued through the day until gray twilight came.

"Maybe Bill won't go to the lodge," 41 A said. "I told him to, but maybe he won't." She spoke without conviction. She knew Bill was already consorting with other Elks.

The room filled slowly with shadows. 41 A lay still, a mournful, lonely figure in her cot.

A nurse came in with my baby lying in the curve of her arm. 41 A started up.

"Let's see her," she demanded for the first time.

The nurse held the bundle close to the girl. One of 41 A's long thin fingers reached out and touched the baby's wrinkled red cheek, another hand felt for the baby's toes. A half articulate, strangling sound came from 41 A.

"Cute!" she managed to say and turned away.

It was very still. The baby, tired of nursing, lay close against me, a sleepy little bundle smelling of warm milk.

In desperation, 41 A broke the silence.

"My man's goin' to give me somethin'," she said. "It's a—it's a—" she breathed hard. "It's a choclut set. There's a choclut pot and six cups and saucers to it. Bill bought it for me himself—he got it at a raffle."

Sublimation! 41 A was steeling herself against agony. She would not think of her baby. She was telling herself that she had a husband, and that she was going to have a chocolate set. She was asking herself fiercely what more anyone could want of life.

From somewhere outside came the sound of a hand-organ. It broke in upon the twilight with a "mother song." Banal, trite, mawkishly sentimental! It's familiar chords resolved inevitably into expected cadences. It wound and slurred into pathetic harmonies and cheap effects. But in it, somewhere, somehow, sounded crude, elemental passion, tenderness, longing, homely pathos, sacrifice—love. They were all there in simplest terms.

The tune ended. The wagon rolled on. My baby stirred with a sleepy little cry.

41 A turned her face to the white-washed wall. Her arms shot up. She gave a choking, heartbroken cry—

"Oh, I want my baby!"

CLARA SAVAGE LITTLEDALE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Myth of the Death Ray

EVER since the Germans were reported to have stopped French æroplanes crossing their territory by means of a new invisible "ray," efforts have been made by English inventors to discover the "secret" of such a powerful war auxiliary. The keen interest taken by the press and the public in their experiments bears witness to the strong impression left on the British mind by the toll of death and destruction taken by German aircraft during the war, and the vivid realization of a possible repetition of such an infliction, with new horrors added by the progress of invention. It is therefore well to inquire into the possibility of any such defensive "ray" capable of stopping or destroying aircraft, being discovered, and whether such a ray would itself constitute a new danger.

Neither Mr. Grindell Matthews nor any of the other claimants have discovered any "ray" or new form of radiation, for the simple reason that none is left to be discovered. There are no new continents to be discovered on the earth, and the realm of radiant energy is now as fully explored as the earth itself. What those inventors appear to have done is not to discover a new radiant beam capable of projection, but to apply one or several of the known radiations to certain well-defined purposes, such as imparting a certain conductivity to the air (which would stop magnetos from functioning) or focusing a destructive beam upon a small object or animal. I have no doubt whatever that the effects obtained are quite genuine, but the question remains to be discussed whether they can be obtained at any considerable distance.

It was Mr. H. G. Wells, I believe, who first conceived the use of a "heat ray" for burning up enemy war material at a distance. During the war many people wrote to the Board of Inventions in England proposing to burn up Zeppelins by means of such a ray. But a brief consideration will show the futility of such a project.

A searchlight acts by keeping a bright beam of light from spreading out and losing its concentration. But the spreading can only be kept within certain well-known limits. It cannot be altogether abolished. A powerful electric arc, burning naked in the open air, is easily seen at a mile at night, but nobody could read by its light at that distance. A two-foot searchlight mirror concentrates the light over half a millionfold, but even so the illumination produced by the light falling on a page of print would not be at all blinding, and reading could be done quite comfortably. In spite of its "concentration" the beam would spread over an area about 100 feet across. And the strange thing is that no amount of "heating up" the arc by putting more current through it will increase the illumination produced a mile away. All it does is to extend the area illuminated without making any portion of it brighter. At five miles the case is twenty-five times worse.

That is the problem in a nutshell—concentration. We can, of course, use a whole battery of searchlights and concentrate their beams upon the target. But at one mile it would take twenty-five searchlights to maintain the beam at its original strength, at two miles it would take 100, and at five miles—quite a practicable "ceiling" for an æroplane—it would take 625 two-foot searchlights to produce and maintain that torrent of light which we see issuing from the mouth of any one searchlight itself. Even then we could not "destroy" anything with it, though we might produce sunburns on the enemy's face!

And we are still only dealing with the most concentrated artificial source of radiant energy known—that of the electric arc. When it comes to invisible heat rays we are even worse off, for their very invisibility is due to their lack of concentration, which reduces their temperature below even "red" heat. Some of the new electric radiators send out a fairly concentrated beam of radiant heat, but it is quite imperceptible even at 100 yards. The new wireless beam recently devised involves a concentration of the beam within an angle of a few degrees. But even one degree means about 100 feet at a mile, and it means a coast-line fifty miles long in the United States, over which the message will be spread.

So much for the rays with a wave-length longer than the rays of visible light. But are there not whole octaves of wave-lengths beyond the violet end of the spectrum, ultra-violet rays, X-rays, gamma-rays, and what not, replete with mysterious and sometimes rather formidable properties? True, but how can they be used for defensive purposes, not to speak of attack? We can easily produce ultra-violet rays by using zinc or aluminium terminals in our electric arc, or by simply burning magnesium ribbon, but these rays are not penetrating. Even ordinary air absorbs them. They do impart a certain conductivity to the air, but that very conductivity stops their farther progress. When we proceed to even shorter wave-lengths we come to rays which may be very penetrating, but which will also penetrate a silvered mirror, and pass through glass without suffering deviation, and so we cannot hope to concentrate them with mirrors or lenses as we can concentrate a searchlight beam. Here again we draw a blank.

There remain certain so-called rays which are not rays at all, strictly speaking. Such are the beta-rays or projected electrons and the alpha-rays or projected atoms of helium. But these are mere atomic bullets, with a microscopic range, and cannot be classed as munitions of war.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The only known way of keeping destructive power concentrated over a considerable range of projection is to fire a shot from a gun. So long as that shot keeps up its speed it maintains its destructive power intact, however far it flies. Aeroplanes flying several miles above us will have to be tackled by artillery or other material munitions. They cannot be stopped by any rays known or likely to be discovered. If we attempt to do so we are not up against the imperfections of our present apparatus. We are up against the properties of space. We cannot defy the law of inverse squares.

There is no Ray Peril.

And even if it should ever arise, there would be no need for panic. All known radiations have been discovered by physicists working serenely in their laboratories, with no hope of reward except a rare prize and the appreciation of their fellows. It is they who are the pathfinders. And if an enemy of mankind should find a new path and use his knowledge to the detriment of his fellow-men, the physicist would soon find a way of neutralizing his activities.

E. E. Fournier D'Albe.

An American Plan to Outlaw War

THE following treaty was prepared by a group of Americans who were deeply interested in the formulation of a practicable plan of disarmament and improved national security and who had all carefully studied the underlying problems. The group consisted of Dr. James T. Shotwell, professor of History at Columbia University, a member of the American delegation at the Paris Peace Conference and a commissioner of the Labor Section of the Treaty; General Tasker H. Bliss, American representative on the Supreme War Council; Dr. Isaiah Bowman, executive head of the technical experts of the American delegation at the Paris Peace Conference; Dr. Joseph P. Chamberlain, professor of Public Law at Columbia University; Professor John Bates Clark, former Director of the Division of Economics and History of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Dr. Stephen P. Duggan, Director of the Institute for International Education of the Carnegie Foundation; General James G. Harbord, former Chief of Staff of the American Army; Frederick P. Keppel, former Assistant Secretary of War; David Hunter Miller, legal adviser to the United States government at the Paris Peace Conference; and Professor Henry S. Pritchett, President of the Carnegie Foundation.

This American group prepared the treaty as a possible substitute for the Draft Treaty of Mutual Assistance which was framed by the Temporary Mixed Commission of the League of Nations and which was not meeting with a favorable reception from certain of the European governments. When prepared it possessed and still possesses, consequently, no official standing. The Council of the League of Nations, however, at its June meeting adopted the unprecedented course of submitting it to the members of the League as an official document—not of course for action but for comment. If it arouses favorable comment it may subsequently be submitted to the members of the League as a proposal which they will be asked to accept or reject.

It has already aroused a great deal of interest in this country and in Europe, and for that reason the New Republic is publishing its complete text. The comment which follows the text was written after consultation by a member of the committee.

The High Contracting Parties being desirous of promoting peace and of lessening the danger of war by reduction and limitation of armaments agree to this treaty.

PART I.
GENERAL MEASURES
CHAPTER I.
Outlawry of Aggressive War

Article 1.—The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that aggressive war is an international crime. They severally undertake not to be guilty of its commission.

Article 2.—A state engaging in war for other than purposes of defense commits the international crime described in Article 1.

Article 3.—The Permanent Court of International Justice shall have jurisdiction, on the complaint of any signatory, to make a judgment to the effect that the international crime described in Article 1 has or has not in any given case been committed.

CHAPTER II.
Acts of Aggression

Article 4.—The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare that acts of agression, even when not resulting in war, and preparations for such acts of aggression, are hereafter to be deemed forbidden by international law.

Article 5.—In the absence of a state of war, measures of force by land, by sea or in the air taken by one state against another and not taken for purposes of defense or for the protection of human life shall be deemed to be acts of aggression.

Any signatory which claims that another signatory has violated any of the terms of this treaty shall submit its case to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

A signatory refusing to accept the jurisdiction of the Court in any such case shall be deemed an aggressor within the terms of this treaty.

Failure to accept the jurisdiction of the Court within four days after submission of a claim of violation of this treaty shall be deemed a refusal to accept the jurisdiction.

Article 6.—The Court shall also have jurisdiction on the complaint of any signatory to make a judgment to the effect that there has or has not in any given case been committed a violation of international law within the terms of Article 4.

Article 7.—The Permanent Advisory Conference hereinafter mentioned shall from time to time consider the further codifying of the principles of international law relating to acts of aggression and preparations for such acts.

In this regard, the conference shall take into account the additional security to the signatories and the progressive

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

disarmament which are by this treaty contemplated.

The recommendations of the conference shall be submitted to the High Contracting Parties for their adoption, and shall also be transmitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

CHAPTER III.
Sanctions

Article 8.—In the event of any H. C. P.* having been adjudged an aggressor pursuant to this treaty, all commercial, trade, financial and property interests of the aggressor and of its nationals shall cease to be entitled, either in the territories of the other signatories or on the high seas, to any privileges, protection, rights or immunities accorded by either international law, national law or treaty.

Any H. C. P. may in such case take other steps toward the severance of trade, financial, commercial and personal intercourse with the aggressor and its nationals as it may deem proper and the H. C. P. may also consult together in this regard.

The period during which any such economic sanction may be continued shall be fixed at any time by the Court at the request of any signatory.

In the matter of measures of force to be taken, each signatory shall consult its own interests and obligations.

Article 9.—If any H. C. P. shall be adjudged an aggressor by the Permanent Court of International Justice, such power shall be liable for all costs to all other H. C. P. resulting from its aggression.

CHAPTER IV.
Decrees of the Permanent Court

Article 10.—The H. C. P. agree to accept the judgment of the Permanent Court of International Justice as to the fulfillment or violation of the contracts of this treaty.

Any question arising under this treaty is *ipso facto* within the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Article 11.—If a dispute arising under this treaty shall be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice, it is for the Court to decide as to its jurisdiction and also whether or not its decree has been complied with.

PART II.
DISARMAMENT
CHAPTER I.
Reduction and Limitation of Armament

Article 12.—The H. C. P. recognizing that excessive armaments constitute a menace of war mutually agree:

(1) To limit or reduce their armaments to the basis necessary for the maintenance of peace and national security.

(2) To study ways and means for future reduction of armaments either as between all signatories or as between any two of them.

CHAPTER II.
Demilitarized Zones

Article 13.—In order to facilitate the security and progressive disarmament contemplated by the present treaty, any H. C. P. may agree with one or more neighboring countries for the establishment of demilitarized zones.

CHAPTER III.
Permanent Advisory Conference

Article 14.—The H. C. P. will call a permanent advisory conference upon disarmament which shall meet not less than once every three years.

This conference shall, in addition to its functions as described in Article 7, publish periodical reports concerning the actual conditions of the armaments of the signatory states.

The conference shall advise the H. C. P. concerning measures to be taken to insure the carrying out of the principles of the present treaty and it may prepare supplementary treaties for the establishment of demilitarized zones and for the further promotion of disarmament and peace.

Article 15.—The Advisory Conference upon disarmament shall appoint a Permanent Technical Committee.

Article 16.—The Permanent Advisory Conference or its Permanent Technical Committee shall give advice on technical questions to the Permanent Court of International Justice at the request of said Court.

Article 17.—The expenses of the Permanent Advisory Conference and of its agencies shall be borne by the signatory powers in the proportions of their respective budgets for defense.

PART III.
INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION
CHAPTER I.
Commission of Inquiry

Article 18.—By the terms of Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations:

"The members of the League undertake to interchange full and frank information as to the scale of their armaments, their military, naval and air programs and the condition of such of their industries as are adaptable to warlike purposes."

In order to facilitate the carrying out of the said engagement by the powers party thereto, the signatories hereto agree that there shall be maintained under the direction of the Council of the League of Nations a commission charged with the duty of making the necessary official examinations and reports.

Article 19.—The said commission shall proceed under such regulations as the Council of the League shall from time to time approve.

Article 20.—Subject to such regulations the members of the commission shall be entitled, when they deem it desirable, to proceed to any point within the territory of any signatory or to send sub-commissions or to authorize one or more of their members so to proceed on behalf of the commission.

Article 21.—The signatories hereto will give all necessary facilities to the said commission in the performance of its duties.

Article 22.—All reports made to the Council of the League by the said commission shall be communicated to the signatory powers.

CHAPTER II.
Opinions of the Council

Article 23.—The Council of the League, taking into account the reports and opinions of the said commission, shall at any time when requested by any signatory hereto, consider summarily whether (a) the armaments of any signatory to this treaty are in excess of those fixed under its provisions; or (b) the military or other preparations of any state are of such a nature as to cause apprehension of aggression or an eventual outbreak of hostilities.

Article 24.—If the Council shall upon such request be of the opinion that there is reasonable ground for think-

*High Contracting Party or Parties.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing that a menace of aggression has arisen, the parties to the defensive agreement hereinafter mentioned may put into immediate execution the plan of assistance which they have agreed upon.

Article 25.—If the Council shall, upon such request, not be of opinion that a menace of aggression has arisen, a public report to the effect shall be made and in such case no signatory shall be under any obligation to put into execution any plan of assistance to which it is a party; but any signatory, believing itself to be threatened with a menace of aggression, notwithstanding the fact that the Council of the League has not been of such opinion, may forthwith notify the Council to that effect, and such signatory shall thereupon have full liberty of action in military or other preparations for defense, subject, however, to the limitations as to armament which are imposed by any treaty then in force other than this treaty and treaties dependent thereon.

PART IV.
TREATIES OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

Article 26.—The H. C. P. may conclude, either as between two of them or as between a larger number, agreements complementary to the present treaty, exclusively for the purpose of their mutual defense and intended solely to facilitate the carrying out of the measures prescribed in this treaty, determining in advance the assistance which they would give to each other in the event of any act of aggression.

Such agreements may, if the H. C. P. interested so desire, be negotiated and concluded under the auspices of the League of Nations.

Article 27.—Complementary agreements, as defined in the preceding article, shall, before being registered, be examined by the Council with a view to deciding whether they are in accordance with the principles of this treaty and of the Covenant.

In particular, the Council shall consider if the cases of aggression contemplated in these agreements are of a nature to give rise to an obligation to give assistance on the part of the other H. C. P.

The Council may, if necessary, suggest changes in the texts of the agreements submitted to it.

When recognized, the agreements shall be registered in conformity with Article 18 of the Covenant. They shall be regarded as complementary to the present treaty, and shall in no way limit the general obligations of the H. C. P. nor the sanctions contemplated against an aggressor under the terms of this treaty.

They will be open to any other H. C. P. with the consent of the signatory states.

Article 28.—In all cases of aggression, for which provision is made in the agreement constituting a defensive group, the H. C. P. which are members of such group may undertake to put into operation automatically the plan of assistance agreed upon between them; and in all other cases of aggression, or menace or danger of aggression, directly aimed at them, they will consult each other before taking action, and will inform the Council of the measures which they are contemplating.

PART V.
PARTIES TO THE TREATY
CHAPTER I.
Accession

Article 29.—Any state, member or not of the League of Nations, may adhere to this treaty by depositing an act of adhesion with the Secretary General of the League, who shall at once inform the other signatories thereof.

CHAPTER II.
Withdrawal

Article 30.—Any party to this treaty may withdraw therefrom by depositing an act of withdrawal with the Secretary General of the League of Nations. Such withdrawal shall take effect one year after the deposit thereof and only as to the party withdrawing.

CHAPTER III.
Ratification

Article 31.—The present treaty shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Secretary General of the League of Nations.

It shall come into force:

In Europe when it shall have been ratified by five European states, including France, Great Britain and Italy.

In Asia when it shall have been ratified by two Asiatic states, one of which shall be Japan.

In North America when ratified by the United States of America.

In Central America and the West Indies when ratified by one state in the West Indies and two in Central America.

In South America when ratified by four states in South America, one of which shall be either Argentina, Brazil or Chile.

In Africa and Oceania when ratified by two states in Africa and Oceania.

With regard to the H. C. P. which may subsequently ratify the treaty, it will come into force at the date of the deposit of the instrument of ratification.

It was at once evident to the committee that the starting point for the discussion of the problem in America was fundamentally different from the basis of European discussion. In the United States the main interest lies in policies of disarmament and the "outlawry of war"; in Europe, especially on the continent, and more especially in these post-war years, the problem of national security takes precedence.

The task of the American committee was to harmonize these two divergent points of view and, ultimately, a draft treaty was drawn up. The treaty which the Council is now circulating to the fifty-four governments of the League of Nations offers for the first time in the history of international law, a comprehensive definition of aggression, and at the same time, outlaws the aggressor.

The definition of aggression is a negative one. Any state refusing summons by another state before the Permanent Court of International Justice on a charge of aggression, thereby admits its guilt. Some reply must be made within four days or the other powers are free automatically to apply the measure of enforcement indicated in the treaty. The four-day time limit is inserted to prevent an aggressor from continuing war-like preparations while trifling with an appeal to the Court. It safeguards the security of the complainant's power. The court is not called upon to decide political and non-justiciable issues as to matters of policy. It has to find whether or not certain overt acts have been committed and whether they violate this contract. In order to define this class of acts a world conference is to assemble frequently, and its experts are to form a permanent commission.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Again, the problem of enforcement has been met by an entirely new method which does not involve the government of any country further than its own interests dictate, and yet, it secures an adequate pressure upon the aggressor by threatening the safety of its business interests.

There is no surrender of national sovereignty.

No troops are to be sent abroad on punitive expeditions or for any other purpose, at the behest of any Council of the League or other outside power. The method of enforcement lies entirely in the economic field.

In the economic sanction the High Contracting Parties do not bind themselves by this treaty to do anything contrary to their own interests. But they are free to do all manner of things as against an aggressor with reference to its property rights on the high seas or within their own frontiers. In a word, the aggressor is outlawed, and, as such, deprived of any security of his property in other lands. Automatically he loses his own security throughout the whole world.

The effect of this outlawry upon business interests would be instant. No trader could be sure that his ships would receive entry into the ports of another signatory or that his investments in their keeping would not be immediately attached. In a world built upon a basis of credit, the result would be for the aggressor unavoidable panic, of greater or less degree. The effect of this would at once be registered in the fall in exchange value of the currency of the agressor state.

It should be remembered that this is not the full extent of the economic sanction for the aggressor state. Sooner or later it will have to pay the whole costs of reparations and of war expenses to both the victims of its aggression, and those powers, even neutral, which have suffered by the economic displacement of the act of aggression. It will thus be seen that the enforcement of the treaty brings into play the two experiences of Europe which have registered most keenly in the mind of the common people as well as governments the disastrous effects of war, namely in the fall of exchange on the one hand and the infliction of reparation penalties upon the other. The whole economic lesson of the World War, the lesson burned into the consciousness and conscience of Europe as nothing else has ever been, is thus brought to bear upon the prevention of war and the preparations for war in the future.

With reference to the adherence of the United States to this treaty, it is evident that some verbal changes are necessary so long as the United States is not a member of the League of Nations, since this treaty has been drawn up for those states which are within the League. But the general principles embodied in the treaty should not meet with technical objections upon the part of the United States and the verbal changes can be easily made by simply eliminating the United States from those articles of the treaty which mention the Council or the League, or by accepting the position of a mere associate. There could be no harm, for instance, in accepting the secretariat of the League as the body which should register treaties. Its usefulness as an agent of public diplomacy is already demonstrated and involves no entanglements. Over five hundred treaties have been registered in the five years of the League's existence, some with powers outside the League. It is simply a formality for securing publicity and is the only international device of the kind that has yet been tried. Since treaties involving the United States are discussed in the Senate, however, even this item need not be maintained in the American edition of the treaty; but it would be inconceivable that the trival difficulties of making slight verbal changes should ever stand in the way of favorable action by the United States upon the question as a whole. This treaty not only embodies ideals of those most anxious that America should play its part in the peaceful settlement of international disputes, but it also carefully avoids all those elements of the League of Nations as outlined in the Covenant which have met with most opposition in the United States.

In short, this treaty leaves the United States, like all other signatory powers, completely free to decide whether and to what extent it will participate in any given case.

The treaty is just as applicable to Germany and Russia as it is to the United States, in that powers can sign it who are not members of the League. The members of the League would simply use more of the machinery of the League than the non-members, in that they would have as well a means for straightening out political controversies and provocative acts which lead to armament. This treaty does not include that kind of action at all. It deals only with the question on armament.

Neither is it a general treaty of compulsory arbitration. The question to come before the Court is not political, but whether or not one of the parties to a contract has broken it. The Permanent Advisory Conference and not the Court will consider the formulation of the conditions to be observed in applying the treaty.

The treaty is not modelled after the Washington treaties, in which the limitation of armament was based upon a set ratio between different countries. Experts, especially in chemical warfare, point out that such ratios cannot be either ascertained or applied at present. Therefore, the treaty calls into existence an international advisory conference on disarmament which is to meet periodically at least once every three years, to keep pace with the progress of invention and discovery. This conference is to be supplied with a technical investigating committee responsible to the conference. The necessity of having a conference on disarmament is recognized on all hands. But what is needed is something more; the conference must be periodic. The experience of the Washington Conference shows that if a conference makes no provision for its own re-assembling, the subsequent recrimination between the interested parties may tend to make matters worse instead of better. On the other hand, if a conference recurs automatically, the questions in dispute can be brought up without involving the national honor of any of the parties to it.

In providing a commission to facilitate the interchange of full and frank information as to the scale of the armaments, the military, naval and air programs, etc., of the High Contracting Parties, the treaty embodies not only a provision of the Covenant of the League of Nations but a device which at the Peace Conference at Paris was strongly urged by Marshal Foch in the interests of the pacification of Europe. The commission charged with the duty of investigating how the various High Contracting Parties were carrying out the terms of this treaty could hardly be objected to by a power which entered into it in good faith. In any case, it is the opinion of highly qualified military experts in the United States that this country would have no objection to the adoption of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

plan so earnestly advocated by Marshal Foch at the Peace Conference. The relation of the Council of the League of Nations to the new machinery which it is proposed to set up should be clearly understood. The Council is to receive the reports of the Commission of Inquiry and express its opinions concerning them. But it cannot call out a League army to enforce peace. The treaty not only makes no provision for such action; its whole tenor is in another direction. And there is no provision whatever for any such army. According to the treaty, the Council would tend to become more and more an instrument of conciliation and its administrative functions in this regard would become inoperative. There is no superstate left in the structure of this treaty. On the other hand, the sphere of operation of the Council is a large and important one. Its function in the political sphere is left untouched. It can still serve to lessen the dangers arising from provocative political policies. This treaty does not touch upon any of those topics. Consequently the sphere of action of the Council does not fully appear. The treaty deals only with security and disarmament. It is an attempt to reduce this dual problem to the dimensions of a contract dealing with strictly technical matters. The Council of the League is not called upon to act outside its legitimate sphere in the enforcement of the treaty or in its administration. Instead of regarding this limitation of its functions as lessening its validity, however, it in reality strengthens its position in the sphere in which it is necessary and legitimate. For nothing could injure an institution more than to clothe it with large theoretic powers which cannot be applied in the hour of need.

Finally, the treaty makes provision for including other treaties between two or more powers either as ententes or alliances, when they are designed solely for defensive purposes, enabling the parties to them to lessen their armaments. A tendency towards the old "balance of power" is perhaps inherent in this part of the treaty. But the treaty safeguards any trend in this direction by placing a great premium upon publicity of engagements as over against secret intrigues. To avoid the danger of including treaties which were in spirit contrary to the purpose of this treaty, this remarkable device has been inserted, taken from the proposals of Colonel Réquin, French military technical expert, in the Treaty of Mutual Assistance prepared for the League of Nations. All publicly announced treaties which have been accepted by the Council of the League of Nations and scrutinized by it as coming within the meaning of this treaty and of the Covenant, may be carried out automatically. There is no need of waiting to secure the consent of the Council, Court, or any other body to carry out their terms. This provision is of the greatest possible importance in the hour of danger, for "in all other cases," the signatories must first "inform the Council of the measures which they are contemplating," and await its action. This means that where there are secret agreements or where acts of aggression arise, there is inevitable delay, for the remedy lies through the machinery of the League of Nations and not by direct action.

No greater incentive for publicity of engagements could be found than this which makes the security of the High Contracting Parties dependent to a large degree upon having announced their engagements to the world through registration with the League of Nations. Freedom for automatic and immediate action may easily be, in cases like these, a matter of life and death.

Vista

IN the garden to this palace presented so long ago to that illustrious Doria by his grateful countrymen, the day comes to an end. From the long terrace under the windows and from the colonnades the walks run, with shaded avenues and marble seats and figures of gods and heroes under ilexes and laurels and cypress trees, until they come at length, past the grottoes and pools and the small fountain jets and the great central fountain with its baroque basin and elaborate deities, to the terrace that overlooks the sea. Close beneath the wall is the harbor shore; and thick along the docks and the farther sand the scores of boats and ships are anchored. The sea is dotted with little sails, white and yellow and rose, bright in the evening air. The big passenger ships and the freighters are steady and fixed at this hour; the small boats, the fishing craft and the sails are coming in, some of them, and some of them going out. The scene of the port, the light, the traffic, and on the other side Genoa, all grow quieter and golden, and achieve a more single tone. They take on a unity that becomes a part of the palace garden.

This Doria garden with its high palace making one end of it, is all so chosen and so splendid that it rouses a competitive stir in the mind. I think of art. I think of the theatre and the course of it in this New York season just ending. I think of what at this moment remains with me out of that season as significant; of scenes, brief intervals, conceptions, that survive the chatter and patter and middle-class efforts toward enthusiasm that afflict the theatre. I try them over now. For all the parts of life, in art, actions, qualities, time, exist together, and must stand a kind of mutual test among themselves of their perfections.

First, as a matter of course, comes Duse, who brought to the theatre of the world a quality that can appear once only in the course of generations, and that to the next generation, who will not have seen her, can never be revealed but only implied through the art of those artists in every field for whom she was the most intense, intangible and fructifying influence of their whole lives. Confronted with the quality of Duse, this garden and palace, this baroque art, dwindles and sinks; it becomes comparable to her only through the mystery of years and the softening light that make its poetry supreme, and touch it with pathos, like some worldly and elaborate passion that fades into a memory. At this moment I think most of Duse's face, her voice, her rhythm; but that first entrance in The Lady from the Sea stands out, for its continuity, its style, its poignancy; the theme of maternal love in the first act of Cosi Sia stands out also, the flowing line, the profound feeling, the simplicity of the second act; the death in the third. I recall the level proportion and the just mind of Duse's reading of Mrs. Alving's long speech in the first scene of Ghosts and the elegance and breeding—in the last definition of those words—of her Porta Chiusa. I think too of the Moscow Art Theatre in The Brothers Karamazoff, not a play at all but great scenes, and especially of Tarasova in the tavern and at the trial, greater acting in the realistic school, brought to the last perfection, pushing life through strict resemblance to a revelation almost beyond itself. The list of these high moments out of any season could never be long, and yet for this season it is not short. Ben-Ami in Les Ratés, an unequal performance, but often remarkable, and most of all in the scenes of the killing of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the wife and when they find him next day sitting against the wall, staring into space, a combination of pathos and power unique in our theatre; Eva Le Gallienne in the last act of Hannele, when she has risen from her coffin and stands at the feet of her gentle chromo Jesus, the pitiful taut smile, the baffling crude pathos of feeling expressed; Lady Diana Manners in The Miracle, her performance consisted for the most part of a beautiful sustained rhythm and a happy physical suitability rather than of acting; her costume and make-up too, however lovely, were out of keeping with the Gothic statues and the surrounding mood of the piece; and yet when she first moved there on her pedestal, a great sweetness and beauty appeared: in The Miracle also, Kraus, an actor not sympathetic perhaps but an extraordinary artist, and in the scene where the cripple is healed, and later when Pan leans out from the column to exercise his magic on the lovers there, a master beyond praise of technique and of style; Morgan Farley in Fata Morgana, in the scene where he falls on his knees and buries his face in the bosom of the woman who has roused in him the depths of a boy's desires and dreams, a beautiful and moving exhibition of something pure and fresh, a strange innocence of passionate life, felt delicately and poignantly by the actor; Clare Eames in The Spook Sonata, in that first moment that we saw her sitting in the cabinet, fine acting, a glamor of beauty plus a terrific nervous concentration; Pauline Lord in Lanzi, the run of her play a failure, but her acting, in the first two scenes especially, of the young girl—one of the best performances that New York has seen in years—realism in the deepest sense, quivering, exact, simple; and finally, in the field of acting far from all these, Beatrice Lillie in Charlot's Revue, not when she was playing in her own person but where she rules the waves, in the black satin gown and flaxen hair, and in the helmet of Britannia, and where she caricatures the determination to keep the centre of the stage against all odds, whether she has anything to contribute or not or gets any pleasure from the spotlight of the world—what talent! A sort of shining whimsical philosophy, done with a sure craft, a gay, infectious oddity precisely understood.

Among other moments on the season's stage, moments less significant than these of Duse and the rest, but pungent and telling nevertheless, I think now of Jane Cowl in that scene where Mélisande goes to look for the lost wedding ring, with Péléas, whom she will not allow to come near her; I remember how, in the midst of a performance often delicately felt and good and sometimes rather forced and dry, and in a play that is beautiful and limp, unforgettable and foolish all together, this scene stood out as searching and poetic, and how Jane Cowl managed somehow to establish there in that dim place, with its shadows, its gray shapes of trees and the dark cavern at one side, the idea of a poignant isolation of life in a surrounding universe. I recall Ethel Barrymore in that first act of A Royal Fandango, a play that began so enchantingly and went to pieces wholly long before the end, I can see now the timid young Spaniard overcome with the beautiful royal lady, and begging her to turn her eyes away, or he would swoon for the passion he felt; the royal lady laying her hand on his and saying that he should tell her about it, and all this done with the finest gift for high comedy in our theatre. In Cyrano de Bergerac, Walter Hampden showed studious intention, conscience and plausibility, not to say obviousness. The talent was slight. His Cyrano lacked of all things magnetism and style, and lacked bravura always. But in the balcony scene where a quieter method might be allowed, the actor's conventional poetry and schooling in Shakespeare came happily to hand, and this, together with the dazzle of Rostand's scene itself, made one of the fine instances of the year. Charles Ellis, when he first entered as the valet in The Spook Sonata, with his clasped hands, his head held forward, the hair plastered flat on the brow, and his whispering speech, created into Strindberg's scene a dramatic quality quite above it, oddly drastic and original, an impression that bites yet into the recollection of the play, and strangely, into this far-off interval.

The light sinks to a quintessence, and becomes the measure of things in their eminence. Within this moment here in the Doria garden are possible only final memories, in life, in art. Some of these scenes from the year's theatre come now to more, some to less, in this place and at this hour, where a beauty emerges that calls out the beauty in the world, and makes of all else a perfect and still oblivion.

STARK YOUNG.

CORRESPONDENCE

Why Blaine Lost

SIR: In your issue of June 11th you published an article entitled Political Corruption and The Public by William E. Dodd. I must correct Mr. Dodd's statement that "Blaine was made forever ineligible to the Presidency because of his comparatively petty wrong-doing."

Two things made James G. Blaine forever ineligible to the Presidency. First, the well-meant but most unfortunate speech of the Rev. Samuel Burchard in which he said "We are Republicans and don't propose to leave our party and identify ourselves with the party whose antecedents have been Rum, Romanism and Rebellion. We are loyal to our flag." These remarks lost more than enough Roman Catholic votes to change the result of the election. Secondly, the miscount of votes in New York City which enabled the Tammany managers to count for Cleveland many ballots which were actually cast for Butler; this gave victory to the Democrats.

Those are the reasons why the presidency was lost to James G. Blaine.

POLLY BLAINE DAMROSCH.

New York City, N. Y.

More Advice to Marian

SIR: Mrs. Wholey's Marian who has a home but wants a job is to be matched by that other middle-aged woman who has a profession but who wants a home.

It's a gruelling process to go to your job, rain or shine, all day long, winter and summer, for twenty-five years, barring a month's yearly vacation, and a trip abroad once in a decade. The average woman on the average salary can't do it and keep house also. The average woman wants a home, a piece of her idealism made visible. She wants friends there to talk.

As for really worth-while conversation happening only among specialists—we all do love to talk shop; but I should die of malnutrition if I couldn't listen to some one whose shop was not my shop. Wouldn't Marian like to have a half-day job, and also keep her house going?

To many middle-aged business and professional women it would be paradise to relinquish half their day, and some pay, to have leisure for home, friends, and self—just a chance to sit in the sun, as George Soule puts it. A specialist is often like a peascod, very full of peas, when she—or he—would rather be pansies.

But the "efficient organization" of our business and professional world has no place for the vital, educated, middle-aged homemaker nor for the trained professional who wants a half-time job. All together then, let's shout the truth, "inefficiency!"—and reform the organization!

FLORENCE L. C. KITCHELT.

Hartford, Conn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Creative Experience

Creative Experience, by M. P. Follett. Longmans, Green and Company. $3.00.

THE biological concept of struggle is no longer for us purely biological. It has become part and parcel of our social thinking. Political scientists, for example, have ceased talking of the state as "perfected rationality" or as an "absolute and fixed end in itself." They now talk, quite nonchalantly, of the state as the arena in which conflicting interests fight out their battles. Social warfare, in short, is regarded as of the essence of political life, the "right" of the actual state being the embodiment of the most powerful might. In economic life the same thought of a persistent and apparently ineradicable conflict prevails—the conflict between capital and labor, producer and middleman, merchant and merchant, worker and worker. In jurisprudence, of course, the thought is hardly new: the courts are the arena of regularized conflict, the whole technique of justice being devised to bring about a settlement which will satisfy at least one party to the fight. Finally, it is increasingly recognized that in the world at large, conflict rages between race and race, nation and nation; while in religion, fundamentalists fight modernists; pietists, secularists.

Philosophers have, in times gone by, made various attempts to describe the quintessential nature of the universe. For Plato, the world in its reality, was an eternal harmony. For Kant, it was a divine moral order. For Hegel, it was an eternally coherent and self-evolving consciousness. For Schopenhauer, it was a will, forever striving to fulfill itself but forever frustrated. And so on. It might be said that the modern philosopher is almost compelled to the position which Heracleitus long ago took, that at the very heart of the universe is conflict. "War is the father of all things." The process of reality is an everlasting fight.

This goes hard with those of us who are working for peace between nations, peace between capital and labor, peace between the races. If the universe itself is conflict, then we might as well throw up the whole nasty business and let the universe simmer in its bellicose stew. As a matter of fact, there have always been two parties to this issue: those who have believed fervently in peace as an actual removal of conflict; and those who, convinced that conflict could never be eliminated, rationalized it into a gloriously beneficent force. "War makes for the manly and adventurous qualities," wrote Theodore Roosevelt.

Doubtless both parties have been wrong and both have been right. The old controversy over the question whether competition was good or bad never was solved by taking one side or the other. There was always a come-back from the other side. For much as we hate strife, the absence of striving against something is easily seen to be a kind of death-in-life. On the other hand, much as we exalt the vigor of struggle, certain kinds of struggle are seen to be nothing more than a kind of hell-in-life.

Obviously the whole idea of conflict needs re-examining. Conflict is energizing; but what kind of conflict? Peace and harmony are the desire of our souls; but what kind of peace and harmony? In this book, Miss Follett has, it would seem, found the solvent idea. Conflict is of the very essence of the creative life. But not all conflict; only conflict in which the spirit and technique are actually creative. And what does that mean? It means this, that it is possible to regard a conflict-situation not simply as an opportunity for the victory of one side or the other, but for the victory of both sides. All the conflicts that we deplore are conflicts in which the sole idea is to suppress the other side. War is that kind of a conflict. So is much of the prevailing conflict between capital and labor, race and race. In such conflicts all the techniques employed are devised solely to the end of winning a complete and smashing victory over the opponent. But suppose one enters a conflict-situation with the thought that that situation presents an opportunity for real inventive thought, the kind of thought which may devise a method of settlement which will yield basic satisfactions to both parties? Entered into with that spirit, conflict becomes the most valuable stimulus for our creative energies. Take, for example, the outstanding conflict between young and old. The traditional technique of age has been to lord it over the young. The traditional technique of rebellious youth has been to break away from the old ones. Already, however, in the better regions of education, a new spirit and a new technique are developing. Age is devising a modus operandi which elicits and sustains the fine independencies of youth. Youth is learning how to illuminate its impulses through the non-coercive guidance of age. As a result, both win. The conflict remains, for youth can never quite get the point of view of age, nor age the point of view of youth; but the conflict is a constant process of inventing new ways in which youth and age operate together.

An example of the inventive opportunity presented by conflict is found in the problem of industrial accident. As the conflict was drawn for many generations, the issue was a sharp antagonism between employer and employe. The employe wished compensation for accident; the employer wished to escape the burden of compensation. Each case at issue was bitterly fought out in the courts, the employe doing his best to prove that the accident was due to no negligence on his part; the employer doing his level best to prove the opposite. If the employe won, most of the damages went to his lawyer. If the employer won, another unfortunate was cast upon the social dust heap. It was war à outrance, with tragedy on the program, whichever side won. Accident insurance was the inventive idea which so solved the issue that both sides won. For by the new device the heavy burden of individual responsibility was removed from the shoulders of the employer; while the still heavier burden of individual risk was lifted from the shoulders of the employe.

It is this central idea, that conflict presents an opportunity for creative thought, creative energizing, which makes Miss Follett's book one the most timely volumes which have appeared within these sorely tried years. Conflict, we now see, is not something to be accepted as indiscriminately good or bad. Conflict is a stimulating opportunity. We may altogether miss the opportunity it presents and go on our stupid way slashing each other with tongues or pogroms or strikes or lockouts or Big Berthas. Or, taking up the challenge of conflict, we may find it the veritable stimulus to a progressive civilizing of our world.

Most Utopias are sentimental evasions. They depict a bliss which never can be. Most of the "hard realisms" are truculent pessimisms. They depict a ruthlessness of nature and man which is largely of their own limited

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

imagining. Both break on the hard rock of conflict. It is a masterly achievement to have taken this hard rock of conflict and used it as a foundation stone for the uprearing of our civilization.

Miss Follett's book, however, is far more than a presentation of this central thesis. It is an acute analysis of our prevailing political misconceptions. It is likewise a most illuminating integration of the more noteworthy conclusions of modern psychology, particularly as they have bearing upon the problems of politics, economics and law. Her chapters on Circular Response, Integrative Behavior and The Gestalt Concept are a challenge to the closet psychologist. Her chapters on law throw a flood of light upon what is happening and what can happen in the processes of law and justice.

The book will be read with appreciation by practical men of business and politics who are also thinkers; and by those thinkers whose intellectual absorption has not locked them utterly away from the despised world of the practical.

H. A. Overstreet.

George III and Pitt

George III and the American Revolution. The Beginnings, by Frank A. Mumby. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. $5.00.

THE fifteen year period between the accession of George III and the first battle of the Revolution on Lexington Green is a field of perennial interest to historians. Mr. Mumby has not, like Lecky, Trevelyan, and Edgerton in England, or Professors Howard and Van Tyne, on this side, presented a consecutive narrative of the causes of the American Revolution. Instead, he has followed the plan of his four volumes on the Tudor period, letting the contemporaries tell the story in their correspondence. More than two hundred letters have been selected from readily accessible sources, such as the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, the correspondence of British and American statesmen, biographies and memoirs, and these letters have been skilfully arranged, with just enough integrating historical comment, to illustrate the policy of the ruling classes in Great Britain and its effect upon public sentiment both in England and in the American colonies during the first fifteen years of George III's reign. It would have been easy for the author, with such a wealth of material to choose from, to make his source book a special plea either for or against the colonial cause; but Mr. Mumby has been scrupulously fair in his selection. Letters of King George, Lord North, the Dukes of Bedford and Grafton, the Earls of Bute and Sandwich, George Grenville and Thomas Hutchinson on the one side are balanced by the protests of Burke, Chatham, Camden, Conway, Junius, Wilkes, Franklin, and Washington on the other, while the caustic irony of that prince of observers and reporters, Horace Walpole, forms a running commentary on the strife of the factions at Westminster.

The point that comes out most clearly in these letters, noted with surprise and sadness in the correspondence of men like Newcastle and Burke, and fully emphasized by Mr. Mumby in his connecting text, is the strange unwillingness of William Pitt to use his unrivalled talents and his enormous influence to unite the Whigs in a consistent opposition to the Bute-Grenville-Bedford policy of coercion of the American colonies. Pitt appears here in an exasperatingly inconsistent rôle. The soundness of his views and the sincerity of his sympathy with the American cause, when he let loose his flood of compelling oratory in Parliament, were patent to all; but his almost sickening servility in the royal presence, his reluctance to sink personal animosities and adversions in the cause of the public welfare, his proud preference to play a lone hand, and his distrust of the efficacy of united party action, deprived the Whigs of the one leader who could have rallied them to present a solid front against the "King's friends". The golden opportunity was presented in early September, 1763. The Bute ministry had come to an end. The new premier, George Grenville, had not yet proposed his fatal stamp act. The King sent for Pitt and received him "very graciously" in an audience of three hours' duration, desiring him to "tell him his opinion of things and persons at large with the utmost freedom." He was ready to bestow the seals upon the Great Commoner, and by the advice of the Earl of Bute at that. But Pitt would not accept office with his brother-in-law Temple at the head of the Treasury, though Temple had been the only member of the cabinet to support Pitt in the Spanish crisis of the autumn of 1761.

The golden opportunity was lost. Instead of Pitt's supplanting Grenville, John Russell, the Duke of Bedford, joined the government as President of the Council. "Thus began the Grenville-Bedford administration" says Mumby, "the crowning blunder of which was the breach between the mother country and the American colonies, which, widened by mutual misunderstandings and the obstinacy of the King, was destined to become irreparable." Twice in 1765 Pitt was urged to take office, on one occasion by no less a person than the King's uncle, the Duke of Cumberland, who visited him at his country house in Kent. A place was waiting for him at any time in the short-lived ministry of the Marquess of Rockingham. But he steadily refused. When at last he consented, on the fall of Rockingham in 1766, to form a ministry on absolutely his own terms, his health was so broken by the tortures of his hereditary gout that he was mentally incapacitated to direct the government. His transfer to the House of Lords as the Earl of Chatham and Viscount Pitt sadly impaired his influence with the people, who had idolized the Great Commoner. The story of the two years nominal ministry of the Earl of Chatham is too well known. It was then that the mischief was done. In Burke's vivid language, "deprived of his guiding influence, they (the ministers) were whirled about, the sport of every gust, easily driven into any port; and as those who joined with them in manning the vessel were the most directly opposed to his opinions, measures and character, and by far the most artful and powerful of the set, they easily prevailed so as to seize upon the vacant, unoccupied and derelict minds of his friends; and instantly they turned the vessel wholly out of the course of his policy." The marplot Charles Townsend seized the abandoned helm and drove the ship of state on the rocks.

As we look back through the generations of our national growth, it is hardly conceivable that it could have been the destiny of America to be anything but a great and free independent nation. But to the men of those fateful years immediately preceding the American Revolution—even to the foremost patriots in America, like Washington, Franklin, and John Adams, whose fervent protestations

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of attachment to the mother country we are forced to credit—a peaceful adjustment of the colonial status through the redress of grievances seemed not only possible but highly desirable. It is easy to be wise after the event. The long habit of virtual self-government, we say, must have eventuated in actual self-government; the fervid appeal to natural rights could not have been satisfied with a better definition and ampler grant of Parliamentary rights; no theory of virtual representation at Westminster could have satisfied men who had been accustomed for a century to make their own laws in their own assemblies, a people whose enconomic freedom was hampered by British regulatory acts would not have been content to rely forever upon protest and evasion to protect their growing commercial and industrial interests. But such a forecast, though present to the minds of some of the more radical men in the colonies, like Paine, Henry, and Samuel Adams was no part of the thought of the liberal British statesmen. They were confronted with a very plain and immediate problem, namely, to preserve the empire by attaching the American colonies to it with the bonds of affection and pride. When Burke warned the ministry of Lord North that if it tried to argue the colonies into slavery, they would "cast your sovereignty in your face;" when Pitt declared that the American colonies had become "too great an object to be grasped but in the arms of affection;" when Walpole rebuked the ruling class of his day as "born with Roman insolence" and acting "with more haughtiness than an Asiatic monarch," these men were speaking in language as strong as that used in the remonstrances and protests from America. Had their counsels prevailed, Mr. Mumby believes that they "would have averted the American War of Independence and left a nobler chapter to be written in the history of the whole English-speaking world." The latter part of his judgment, at least, is not to be disputed.

In his preface Mr. Mumby quotes Professor A. M. Schlesinger to the effect that "the average American still accepts without qualification or question the partisan justifications of the struggle for independence which have come down from the actual participants in the affair on the American side . . . and condemns as unpatriotic any effort to consider the origins of the War for Independence from a standpoint of historical detachment." He believes that "this conception of patriotism is undergoing revision," and that we are learning "the danger of teaching propaganda in the guise of history." We fear that if Mr. Mumby were thoroughly conversant with the attitude of large groups of our citizens towards the recent attempts of historians to tell this part of our story with detachment and impartiality, he would have to revise his own too optimistic judgment. We would commend this volume by a fair minded English scholar to those misguided Americans who confuse patriotism with the noisy assertion of a prejudiced and indefensible chauvinism.

DAVID S. MUZZEY.

Alliances for the Mind

Alliances for the Mind, by Gertrude Besse King, with an introduction by Walter Lippman. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.00.

THE papers which compose this volume seem to have been assembled by friends of Mrs. King, who died in 1923, as a provisional offering in anticipation of a more original and more personal book to follow. That book, as Mr. Lippmann observes in his sympathetic introduction, will lean less on books written by others.

These detached pieces are presented in the guise, mostly, of book-reviews; but they are more than that, and they really merit the appellation of "essays" which the introduction accords. Mrs. King delighted to function among difficult authors and difficult ideas, and she invites the thoughtful reader to exercise his mental molars and incisors on a rich variety of problem-posers: Einstein, Bergson, John Dewey, Bertrand Russell, Graham Wallas; philosophy, biology, mysticism, hyperspace, sociological psychology, and other knotty interests.

Einstein, in particular, appears on many pages. The opening paper (not one of the best) is devoted to his relativity, perhaps on grounds of timeliness; and its title, Aladdin Einstein, seems a concession to popular taste and interest which is less obtrusive—or non-existent—elsewhere. Also, remove one or two short and unimportant book notices, inclusion of which is no advantage, and little remains to cavil at, however much may remain for varying minds to controvert.

Mrs. King, despite a training at Vassar and Radcliffe, and work in bio-physics at Harvard and service on the staff of the Massachusetts General Hospital, has room in the universe and in her own composition for mysticism. "If the thinker feels that he must get all his estimates under the canopy of the One," he must choose between his desire for familiarity and his desire for mystery. And mysticism, she holds, has a real contribution to make to philosophy. "The emotional states to which it gives rise seem to stir up fresh depths and incite thinkers to take account of hitherto neglected facts, and they answer a fundamental human craving for mystery and a sense of human importance. When thought has gone just as far as it can, it is wonderfully soothing to have the bosom of God to leap into."

The real test of a thinker's quality may be found in the treatment of current questions in times of stress and heat. The paper on The Servile Mind—which is the war mind of the crowd under direction and manipulation—was written in 1916, at the peak of the war. Its poise, clearsightedness and impartiality are remarkable, and they induce the reader to accept the author all the more confidently as a guide through the recondite thickets of thought that so many of her pages traverse—whether on such standardized subjects as Plato and the poets, or on such contemporaneous questions as the non-Euclidian geometry and on the matter of discipline for ultra-Freudians.

In addition to such alliances for the mind as the general body of the book offers, there is a concluding paper on New Alliances for the Mind, which has the merit of propelling us into the future, with its exactions and possibilities. Thus, man, with his needs and his hopes, is rescued from the mechanists. "An undesigned and untended and unregulated machine is unthinkable." If you take the purpose out of man, you have to put it somewhere else in the universe. The Humpty Dumpty who is analyzed on the basis of his fall and its effects is not a real Humpty Dumpty unless and until again synthesized. The child shrinking from the fire is not a mere bundle of physical reflexes, but involves the added elements of memory and time. "The organism is not a

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

static thing, because living is a process of change, and to go on living it has to maintain a traffic between itself and its environment."

The last pages also carry on into the future the relations between philosophy and science. Philosophy has been brusquely defined by some one as "a synthesis of the sciences." The separations affected by "temporary concentrations of attention," such as science requires, do not, Mrs. King reminds us, either sever nature or destroy its organic interdependencies.

To see this fact, she says, is the great function of philosophy. "And while philosophy welcomes the contributions of the separate sciences which must hold their problems sufficiently isolated for purposes of intensive scrutiny, still it realizes that these contributions but prove in their exquisite and symmetrical relations the depth of unity and the depth of diversity that pervade the universe."

To understand still better this universe is of course our future study. The foregoing excerpts, haphazard though they may be, will serve to indicate the range of the author's interests and the trend and predilections of her mind. To one who would obtain at least some glancing familiarity with the exacting themes that tease the mind of modern man, the present volume may be recommended as of interest and consequence.

HENRY B. FULLER.

The New Romance

The Thousand and First Night, by Grant Overton. New York: George H. Doran Company. $2.00.

Caravans by Night, by Harry Hervey. New York: The Century Company. $2.00.

The Black Parrot, by Harry Hervey. New York: The Century Company. $2.00.

Heu-Heu, or The Monster, by H. Rider Haggard. New York: Doubleday, Page and Company. $1.75.

Mistress Wilding, by Rafael Sabatini. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company. $2.00.

Bardelys the Magnificent, by Rafael Sabatini. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin Company. $2.00.

WHEN Stevenson came along to play the sedulous ape in the mighty forest grown by the huge procreative epochs of Dumas and Scott he was too cozened by the gay sport of his fancied rôle ever to foresee the disastrous consequences of his activity.

He did a grave disservice to the romantic movement of the 'nineties by taking it seriously, a graver disservice to his reputation by play-acting so much about his own life, a worst disservice of all to romance by confining its great scope to tales of boyish escapades made up of picturesque scenes. He thereby killed the thing he loved. He threw away the tarnhelm and put on the helmet of Navarre. He fixed romance as a type word which calls up the turrets and mailed men of Scott without the penetential glooms of the Covenant, which evokes the flourish and the brave gestures of Dumas without the profound sadness which underlies all Dumas. Stevenson wrote a Marguerite de Valois without a Saint Bartholomew's massacre, and a Roderick Random without blood and torture. In Treasure Island even the oaths are expurgated and picturesque. Stevenson invented a romance which leaves out women and death. Romance became another word for adolescence.

After Stevenson the term romance has had no status. It is almost a term of contempt to define a literature offered to sedentary office men who want to drink their blood like wine. If Stevenson had not existed the romantic novel would not be advertised as an escape from pessimism and realism, and Sabatini would not be offered as an antidote to life. If we may judge, however, by an influence twenty years old and certain examples one year old, romance has recovered its status, or at least got a new status. In these last few years writers have left off imitating Stevenson and Kipling. They have come under the influence of Conrad, and by its precept and inspiration have brought back romance to an estate of honor.

Before Joseph Conrad came to lift grisly plots out of penny dreadfuls and invest their tin-pot heroics with the dignity of a mature disillusion, romance was little better than picturesque melodrama. The Stevenson and Weyman and Haggard and (for that matter) the Kipling hero goes through a bewilderment of adventure only to arrive at the most exemplary or the most callow conclusions about life. The tropics glow only as a painted background. Treasure Island has no Heart of Darkness, and from the vast horrors of Africa, Allan Quartermain brings back the philosophic speculations of a village curate. Stevenson leaves out two vast and terrible continents, the soul of a man and that heart of darkness which is nature. There is no psychology of character, and adventure is all in a day's piracy. The hero hardly is aware of the inscrutable twilight of the human breast, and so from the fearful grandeur of the Middle Ages or the tropics he returns with a display of picture postcards decorated with legends of good cheer and charts about the weather and the patter songs of the natives. In Treasure Island a nice old ruffian is the hero, and the island is only an excuse for pieces of eight multiplied by engaging pirates. In Typhoon a tornado is the hero and the captain is the plot. Stevenson would have written Victory as peace without the victory of death. We already know what irony and majesty Conrad has put into plots as obviously picturesque as King Solomon's Mines and The Man Who Would Be King and The Wrecker.

The argument does not really devolve into a bout between Conrad and Stevenson but rather into a bout between the imitators of the two principals wherein the followers of Conrad do not make you ashamed of their captain. The plots in the Stevenson and the Conrad tradition are often enough nearly identical, but a difference in mood and psychology really does appear to establish a new romance. Of course in Heu-Heu, or The Monster, Rider Haggard is still haunted by Charles Reade rather than by Stevenson, but he has learned nothing from Conrad. Such obviously Stevenson books as Rafael Sabatini's Mistress Wilding and Bardelys the Magnificent in comparison with Harry Hervey's Caravans by Night and The Black Parrot and Grant Overton's The Thousand and First Night are simply grotesque, nothing more. In accredited romance, written just for pleasure and not to improve the mind, Sabatini's mounting flood of books has no business in the company of Harry Hervey and Grant Overton. Sabatini is simply up to Stanley Weyman's old tricks. His remainders and left-overs from Stevenson seem lamentably old and rusted and without any meaning even for such an one as myself who has (before Conrad) revelled in Stanley Weyman and Lovett-Yeats and others of the 'nineties whose names in these days no one knoweth.

Mr. Hervey has apparently no more serious purpose than the conjuring up of gorgeous carnivals of adventure

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in Indo-China and Thibet, Borneo and Siam, tales of the British Secret Service and women who go to the Orient seeking not the thin romance of destiny but the heartless mystery behind the splendorous veil of the tropics. Mr. Overton's story of three generations flits from an aeroplane landing on Long Island to the life of Vasco da Gama, thence to a wreck in the Pacific ocean, and so into modern times again wherein the loves of three centuries meet and are consummated in madness and death. Both Mr. Hervey and Mr. Overton have taken over the magic of Conrad, the ideas and the very soul of Conrad, but in the process they have done more than borrow. It is infiltration rather than imitation. It is work of distinction and maturity and enthralment. Unlike Sabatini and other followers of Stevenson, they produce heroes with consciousness, men who are perhaps working for the Secret Service and yet are also Lord Jims and Heysts questioning the very illusion of romance, women who are heroines and yet also minds caught up into the intolerable mystery of our alien world and the impenetrable hinterlands which lie behind the vain appearances of nature. It is not life as the picturesque adventure of a jolly cabin boy, but life visible as an illusion and a mighty dream.

Over the minds of these writers and the minds too of the tired business reader the soul of Conrad broods as a spirit over the unresting deep. Romance is not given us to fill idle hours. The hours are not idle. In their momentary suspension of eternity the soul takes the wings of the morning and travels to the uttermost isles not to find bright boyish escapades, but rather to release the disillusion of the modern mind within a world of mature romance bearing the dream of life within its heart like a magical vision in a cleft of death.

A. Donald Douglas.

Sunrise Trumpets

Sunrise Trumpets, by Joseph Auslander, with an introduction by Padraic Colum. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.00.

Mr. Auslander is a distinctive poet who has developed a style which will amply repay his readers. For several reasons his poetry strikes me as being Gothic. It is for the most part sombre, it is pervaded with a deep spiritual solemnity, and it is heavily ornamented. Its richness is the richness of tapestry and brocade, for its lines are laden with jeweled words, with gold-incrusted figures. There are few light textures to be found in his book—no shimmering silks or cool linens or fragile lace—and this may seem to some a pity; but after all, too many things cannot be expected of a weaver of tapestries.

It is instantly apparent to a reader of Sunrise Trumpets that the author is enamored of sombre and metallic colors. His lines are literally "shot with silver." Sometimes it is "wet silver," again, "drenched silver," and again, "shattered silver." He is fond of "gold," also, and of "bronze" and "black" and "sombre crimson." With very few exceptions he paints his scenes with these colors. There are no bright, happy, sparkling colors—except white, which he uses to suggest the atmosphere of life and gaiety.

This mania of dark hues and lustrous metallic surfaces becomes a trifle oppressive, but one must admit that it is perfectly in keeping with the texture of the poems and with the atmosphere which they invoke. And Mr. Auslander is concerned largely with atmosphere. The possessor of a subtle taste, and of a gift for penetrating the veiled recesses of life, he is led to express in his poetry those uncertain moments of dawn and twilight, in their many manifestations. He is not attracted by the positive light of day nor by the positive dark of night. It is the suspended instant, the instant of mystic transition, the fearful, illusive pause between the pulse-beats of time, that captures his poetic imagination; and it is in the expression of these weird and breathless moods that he is at his best. He has the faculty of slipping down into the earth and hearing it breathe, of entering into the life of insects and lonely marsh birds, and finally of bringing back in terms of human music the essence of the mysteries he finds.

> Somewhere water challenged silence, somewhere water failed;
> Spiders brooded thick in silver and the willows dreamed.

To have written that is to have projected the imagination surely into a dim distance penetrable only by a finely tuned sense. Another quotation will emphasize his mastery over pallid and eerie atmospheres:

> . . . through the drenched silver willows; everywhere:
> In the sulphurous fluctuant marsh this side the steaming meadows
> Where black weeds trouble the moon's drowned hair.

It seems to me that Mr. Auslander's chief fault is his fear of verbal weakness. He does not always manifest sufficient faith in simplicity of utterance, and that faith certainly should be the guiding star of every poet. There is a kind of strength gained by a sequence of heavy, insistent words, especially if each word be beautiful in itself, but that strength is apt to be momentary, and poems built upon it will be read and forgotten—not treasured in the memory. In certain of these poems the melody breaks under the strain of vocabulary, and in a few instances the thought is obscured as well. In others, however, the diction is simple, light, and swift, and there is gain rather than loss of power. The lyric entitled Invalid, for example, begins as follows:

> She has the look of statues, having lain
> Many years in her bed
> That was like a cave where pain
> Is gathered into corners and quieted.

That is a stanza which, because of both the excellence of the figure employed and the easy, explicit diction, might cling to the memory forever.

Glenn Hughes.

Contributors

Sisley Huddleston, British journalist, is a former Paris correspondent of The London Times. His book, Poincaré, A Biographical Portrait, has just been published by Little, Brown and Company.

Clara Savage Littledale was formerly on the staff of the New York Evening Post.

Glenn Hughes, an instructor at the University of Washington, has translated a number of Japanese poems.

E. E. Fournier D'Albe, British physicist, is the inventor among other things of the needle periscope and the optophone.

Henry B. Fuller of Chicago is the author of many novels and short stories and of a book of verse, Lines Long and Short.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED